THE DISCIPLES DIVINITY HOUSE
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

HERBERT LOCKWOOD WILLETT
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
CARLI: Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois

http://www.archive.org/details/christianunionqu21unse

VOL. XXI No. 1

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

JULY 1931

ONE OF THE EARLIEST CHRISTIAN GEMS

CONTENTS

At the Editor's Desk

Bishop Gore's Philosophy of the Good Life . . ARTHUR B. KINSOLVING

The Appeal of Yesterday to the Bible . . . . . W. J. LHAMON

The Christian Unity We Now Have . . . . . THOMAS F. OPIE

Baltimore's Youth Contributes to Religious Unity . E. FOSTER DOWELL

The Common Heritage of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ and the Evangelical Church . . RAYMOND W. ALBRIGHT

What Is Our Standard? . . . . . DANIEL SOMMER

What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity

Fellowship at the Lord's Table — Holy Communion and Unity — North India Round Table Conference on Union — Third Biennial Pennsylvania Conference — Friendship Between Jews, Catholics, and Protestants — Are Catholic and Evangelical Views on the Ministry Reconcilable? — The Church of To-morrow Must Coöperate to Win

Book Reviews

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Inc.

W. H. HOOVER, President

BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

AGENTS:

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York

Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka, and Sendal

$2.00 a year 50 cents a copy

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Savior — are parts of the Church of Christ and the recognition of their Equality before God is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and equally free to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ — growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in His own words,—"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another."

1646

CONTENTS

JULY, 1931

VOL. XXI. No. 1.

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK 3

BISHOP GORE'S PHILOSOPHY OF THE GOOD LIFE ..... ARTHUR B. KINSOLVING 15

THE APPEAL OF YESTERDAY TO THE BIBLE ..... W. J. LHAMON 30

THE CHRISTIAN UNITY WE NOW HAVE ..... THOMAS F. OPIE 40

BALTIMORE'S YOUTH CONTRIBUTES TO RELIGIOUS UNITY ..... E. FOSTER DOWELL 46

THE COMMON HERITAGE OF THE CHURCH OF THE UNITED BRETHREN IN CHRIST AND THE EVANGELICAL CHURCH ..... RAYMOND W. ALBRIGHT 55

WHAT IS OUR STANDARD? ..... DANIEL SOMMER 66

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 72

BOOK REVIEWS 92

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

Ten Hills, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in January, April, July, and October, is fifty cents a single copy, or two dollars a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion or individual contributing annually $5.00 or more to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY EXTENSION FUND will be entitled to receive three copies of THE QUARTERLY free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copies to some designated persons or institutions.

Entered as second-class matter October 18th, 1923, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A., under the Act of Congress of March 3rd, 1879.

The Christian Union Quarterly

EDITOR

PETER AINSLIE, D.D., Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, JR., D. D., Rector St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

DR. HAMILCAR ALIVISATOS,
Athens, Greece.

REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAN CHARLES R. BROWN,
New Haven, Conn.

PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
New York, N.Y.

REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.

PROF. DR. J. EUGENE CHOISY,
Geneva, Switzerland.

REV. S. D. CHOWN, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada.

DR. J. A. CRAMER,
Utrecht, Holland.

PROF. DR. ADOLF DEISSMANN,
Berlin, Germany.

REV. A. W. FORTUNE, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky.

DR. W. E. GARRISON,
Chicago, Ill.

PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE,
London, England.

MOST REV. METROPOLITAN GERMANOS,
Thyatira, Asia Minor.

PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER,
Elon College, N. C.

DR. HENRY T. HODGKIN,
Wallingford, Pa.

REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAN W. R. INGE,
London, England.

PROF. RUFUS M. JONES,
Haverford, Pa.

DR. ADOLPH KELLER
Geneva, Switzerland

BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL,
New York, N. Y.

BISHOP WILLIAM F. MCDOWELL,
Washington, D.C.

REV. JOHN HOWARD MELISH
Brooklyn, N. Y.

REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

DR. WILFRED MONOD,
Paris, France.

DR. C. C. MORRISON,
Chicago, Ill.

DR. JOHN R. MOTT,
New York, N.Y.

BISHOP HARALD OSTENFELD,
Copenhagen, Denmark.

BISHOP EDWARD L. PARSONS,
San Francisco, Calif.

PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS,
Lancaster, Pa.

PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE,
Oxford, England.

PASTOR DR. FRIEDRICH SIEGMUND-SCHULTZE,
Berlin, Germany.

DR. ROBERT E. SPEER,
New York, N.Y.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA,
Upsala, Sweden.

DR. HENRY VAN DYKE,
Princeton, N. J.

REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich.

BISHOP BOYD VINCENT,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK,
York, England.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

JULY, 1931

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK

WITH this issue *The Christian Union Quarterly* begins its twenty-first year. There is something sentimental, if not significant, to enter upon the twenty-first year of existence. There have been vast changes in everything in the last twenty years and especially in one's outlook on Christian unity. *The Christian Union Quarterly* has itself changed. It started cautiously, if not timidly, twenty years ago upon an uncharted sea for there was no publication then devoted exclusively to Christian unity. The editor has done his work gratuitously through these years and has done it amid the demands of a large and busy city pastorate. Contributors have given their articles without any request for financial remuneration and among these have been articles that were equal with the best in any magazine. But the mechanical side of a publication like *The Christian Union Quarterly* costs money, especially when requests come from all parts of the world for it, so that it may be read to-day under nearly every flag in the world. These readers are Protestant, Anglicans, Eastern Orthodox, and Catholics — men and women in these communions who are thinking in terms of a united brotherhood.

At first the cost was borne by the conservative Disciples, but it is only fair to say that the conservative element in any communion would hardly be the most cordial supporters of real Christian union such as

The Christian Union Quarterly advocates. The supporters of this union must be found among the liberals in the various communions. In this instance Mr. W. H. Hoover, a liberal Disciple, created an endowment whereby *The Christian Union Quarterly* may continue its testimony in these years for a united Christendom. There have always been great gifts for denominational purposes, but this takes its place by the side of gifts for interdenominational and undenominational interests. It is encouraging, too, that gifts of this character are multiplying. This is the only one, perhaps, that is dealing directly with Christian unity through a publication. In another generation there will be many more such gifts.

With this issue there is a change of type and in the general appearance of the magazine, but holding to the same size, only making a few improvements. It is regretted that Dean H. E. W. Fosbroke, New York, feels that he should retire from the editorial council, but it will be received with satisfaction that Rev. John Howard Melish, D.D., rector of the Protestant Episcopal church of the Holy Trinity, Brooklyn, New York, and Rev. Adolph Keller, D.D., general secretary for education and extension of the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work, Geneva, Switzerland, become members of the editorial board. These have already made contributions of marked worth in understanding among Christians. *The Christian Union Quarterly* takes pleasure in greeting its readers on this occasion and, without the slightest reservation, it insists that there must be the recognition of equality of all Christians before God before we can go very far in Christian unity.

CHRISTIAN unity is possible when Christians take it seriously. Religion can not function at its best unless it is a brotherhood. A church in love is the need of the world. Christians may differ in a thousand things, but there is no good reason why Christians can not show to the world their equality before God. The things that give them distinction from other Christians are not primary. The primary things are Jesus and love of the brethren. To limit one's love to his party is not Christian love. That is party love. Christian love is love of the brotherhood — the whole Christian family. To talk about a Disciple brotherhood, a Methodist brotherhood, a Baptist brotherhood, is dodging the question. These are sectarian phrases. There is no Disciple Jesus or Methodist Jesus or Baptist Jesus. There is one Jesus — Jesus the Christ; there is one brotherhood and that is the whole Christian family. Because it is broken and separated is no reason to apologize for it and set up phrases to cover the shame of it. Our divisions must be abandoned for the unity of the followers of Jesus.

IT was recently announced in the daily papers that three priests of the Protestant Episcopal church had joined the Catholic church. There was no impropriety in that. People are constantly changing their church relations and priests and ministers are doing the same thing. People change their opinions and act accordingly. It is not a primary matter in changing from one church to another. But that which was arresting was that these priests were rebaptized. Perhaps the word rebaptized was not used—just the word baptized, which

made it that much worse. What was wrong with the Protestant Episcopal baptism? It was done in the same authority as that used by the Catholic church and with a certain apostolic succession flavor about it so that if it suited any body of Christians, a Protestant Episcopal baptism ought to have suited the Catholic church. Maybe the Protestant Episcopal priest in administering baptism crossed his little finger instead of his forefinger, or he may have sneezed just as he was about to pronounce the blessing. Either of these objections is as absurd as what a Catholic might point as invalid in a Protestant Episcopal baptism. Just so long as these absurd requirements prevail the church that does it is giving itself to sectarian wall building. These are the things we have got to abandon if we expect to minister to a needy world that is eager for a living religion.

THE consummation of the union between the Congregationalists and Christians at their recent annual gathering at Seattle set up a mile post in the progress toward the united church in the United States. This is now the eighth communion that belongs numerically in the million group of American churches. These are Catholics, Baptists, Methodists, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Disciples of Christ, Protestant Episcopalians, and Congregational-Christians. Both of these communions are to be commended for this adventure. While the Congregationalists were the larger body, the Christians furnish an interesting study in their attitude toward union in their history of little more than one hundred years. They had a background that was Presbyterian, Metho-

dist, and Baptist. Their leaders came out of these communions. They had a passion for Christian unity. Finding that they had come to a similar position to that of the Disciples except on the subject of baptism, the majority of them accepted baptism by immersion and became a part of the Disciple household. To this day "Christian" is the term by which the Disciples are known in Kentucky, Missouri, and other sections due to the influence of that union, some preferring the name "Christian" and others "Disciple." But that union made no definite contribution to Christian union because the Christians were largely absorbed by the Disciples. Union must not come by absorption. While the Disciples have talked about Christian union since then as they did before, they have not made a definite contribution except on the part of about one hundred open membership churches, because they have been unwilling to modify their position on the dogma of immersion baptism and, therefore, not willing to accept into their fellowship those who have been baptized by other modes of baptism. But the Christians will not have that difficulty with the Congregationalists. It will furnish a wider field for their passion and there is no reason why this union should not open the way to a new hope for the union of American Protestantism.

THE Christian Unity League will hold a conference in Cleveland, Ohio, November 17-19, 1931, and in St. Louis, Missouri, the second week in February, 1932, followed by several conferences westward as far as the Pacific coast. The programs for Cleveland and St.

Louis are among the best ever announced. The interest in this subject is one of the prophetic indications of these times. Commissions are now at work on reports such as "The United Church of Canada," "The United Church of the United States," "Unity Movements in Politics, Science, and Industry and their Influence on Unity Among Christians," and "The Basis of Religious Experience and Christianity's Function for the Unification of that Experience." The indications are that these conferences will be largely attended and courageous thinking will characterize them. This issue is here. We can not dodge it. Our duty is to face it frankly and find the way to fellowship.

LAST summer at the meeting of the continuation committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order, Bishop Edwin Palmer of India presented what was accepted as the attitude of the committee toward intercommunion. He said:

> The interest in it is so great that it is certain to be brought up. The question which we have now to consider is, how it ought to be handled. It is clearly within our province to define intercommunion. Part of the present trouble arises from the vague way in which the word is used. Beyond this we could profitably and rightly discuss, What are the conditions which make intercommunion between churches and groups of churches justifiable and regular? Then further, Are there conditions when occasional or partial intercommunion is justifiable? But such a formulation of the subject as "General intercommunion between all Christian churches ought to be immediately adopted," would be outside our province. This is an administrative matter and belongs to the churches. The most that belongs to us is to show that when certain conditions are fulfilled, intercommunion between churches may (or ought to) follow,

and to leave the churches to decide whether such conditions are actually fulfilled in their respective cases.

The difficulty with this statement is that it has no windows in it. There is in it not the slightest desire that intercommunion should be practiced among the followers of Jesus, but instead, a desire that the traditions of the churches shall be upheld. I like Bishop Palmer and I wish he had expressed some desire that intercommunion should be practiced, perhaps referring it back to the churches as a pressing need in our approaches toward each other, but to leave it where he did is to leave it where Lausanne left it. We must make some progress if not in our practice, certainly in our thinking.

THE controversy between the Catholic church and the Italian government has apparently come to an amicable adjustment. But it is not settled. It can never be settled until there is an absolute separation between church and state. A church is out of its field when it undertakes to be a part of the political government. This had its beginning in the days of Constantine. For a time it flourished and looked as though it had become a permanent alliance, but it was only apparent. In these later years a definite separation between church and state has set in and eventually the separation will become permanent throughout the world. In the years that the alliance prevailed it was a great injury to the Catholic church. It put the church in royal processions and gave to the church a certain social prestige, but neither of these has any worthwhile merit in the ministry of the church. The day the Catholic church cuts loose

from all governmental alliances and devotes itself solely to spiritual ministrations will be the day of its rebirth. The whole Catholic philosophy runs counter to this change; consequently it will not come by Catholic initiative, but rather by the action of the political governments — perhaps through periods of deep sorrow to the Catholic church because it may appear to be the loss of prestige and opportunity. But the facts are just the opposite. Being separated from the state it will gain finer prestige and have greater opportunities in serving mankind.

THE American mind is a conundrum to the people of other countries, sometimes to ourselves. The League of Nations was an American idea, but the United States refused to join the League. The World Court was also an American idea, but the United States is not officially a member of it. The outlawry of war is an American idea and has been concurred in by the nations of the world, but the Supreme Court of the United States and the war department of our government appear never to have heard of it. The recent air maneuvers at the instance of the war department were doubtless done to stir up the war spirit or counteract whatever was done the same week by the educational department of the government for building up international friendship. Perhaps a secretary of war can not think in terms of the outlawry of the thing of which he is its secretary. He must contend for the system of which he is its head even though the thing has been outlawed by his nation and the other nations of the world. But the Supreme Court of the United States is

less excusable. Five members of that court, making a majority of one, belong in the days of the Roman empire under the Cæsars. They are good men, learned men, but they are legalists of that extreme type to whom the atmosphere of a new idealism created by the outlawry of war is so uncongenial that they can not think in it. The case of Professor D. C. Mackintosh of Yale Divinity school gave to the Supreme Court of the United States the greatest opportunity in its history, whether it would follow a strictly legalistic path of Roman empire thinking with all of its dire consequences or whether it would interpret moral questions in the light of a new idealism which had been created by the outlawry of war. The court fell down, fell down badly. The chief justice and the three justices associated with him gave a spirited minority opinion and somewhat pulled the court out of its entanglement, but it remains that the majority opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States is on the side of the long ago Roman policy and the more recent Prussian policy of government being the conscience of the state in all affairs having to do with other peoples. Were it a case of mass murder versus a world court to adjust an international dispute, it appears that the majority opinion of the Supreme Court would be on the side of mass murder. As a constitutional interpretation, all courts must recognize that history is the commentary of constitutions. The Kellogg-Briand peace pact has given a new day to civilization. There are multitudes who are citizens of the new day, so many of us who will have nothing to do with war that, in the event of another war, the Supreme Court of the United States may have occasion

to reaffirm or reverse writing into our constitution a tyranny which our forbears did not tolerate, neither will we.

ON the whole subject of war the church has been so hazy that we need not be surprised at a court's hostility to interpreting the constitution regarding one's attitude toward war in the terms of the new day in which we live when there is already a world court to adjust international disputes rather than the old policy of adjusting them by mass murder. The churches are passing strong resolutions in favor of the abolition of war. Resolutions are harmless, likewise peace speeches. It must be born in mind that the Constantinian policy has prevailed in the church for fifteen hundred years. A few prophets like Tolstoy broke with this policy and were excommunicated; a few smaller bodies like the society of Friends likewise broke with this policy. But the larger communions have not had that break. It is difficult to be sure of them even though they pass strong resolutions. Until the churches recall their chaplains and wash their hands of the whole bloody business of war they can not be taken seriously on this subject. Let soldiers be ministered to by civilians as ministers and priests now serve in various institutions, but not by governmental chaplains. There are enough Christians in the world to-day to make another war impossible and, at the same time, to make the World Court as permanent among the nations as is the Supreme Court in the affairs of the United States. It is not an infallible court, as our Supreme Court is not, but it is a thousand times better than mass murder methods. But the theological

seminaries, where priests and ministers are made, and the denominational papers, which the leaders in the denominations are supposed to read, are usually shy on governmental chaplains and war in general. Until there are radical changes in these sources there can not be larger hope regarding a reliable attitude of the churches in preference for a world court to mass murder for adjusting international disputes. Most of the denominational seminaries and the denominational press are still under the spell of the Constantinian policy. But a new day is here, not coming, but is here now. Truth is being enforced by the freer members of the churches and many who are not members of the churches.

IT is a general regret that the Southern Presbyterian church in the United States voted at the last Assembly meeting to withdraw from the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. While this undoubtedly represented a majority of the mind of the Assembly, there must be many in the Southern Presbyterian church who think differently. One thing all Christians have got to learn is that it is more important to know how to live with people from whom we differ than it is to separate ourselves from others and set up our own ideas of doctrines and morals. A group of Disciples are meeting in Indianapolis, Indiana, this month to try to find some basis of agreement in their divided household. Such a conference is to be commended. When a minister of an open-membership church was invited, several of the brethren of close membership churches refused to attend. On learning of this condition this minister withdrew and the other brethren

agreed to come. The issue between these two groups is that the open-membership group maintains that all Christians are equal before God whatever be their form of baptism; the other group dissents from that position — the immersed having precedence. Years ago these things irritated; now they arouse pity. This Disciple conference has in it an element of value. The churches of Christ, a division among the Disciples numbering three or four hundred thousand, will be represented. If these two groups — churches of Christ and Disciples — can be brought to think more kindly of each other, it will do good. This is their first meeting together and the conference is in the hands of a conciliatory management. But one of the difficulties in Christian unity is that every communion appears to think it has received a divine commission to guard something, doctrine or history, and they are always ready to contend rather than to coöperate. As a matter of fact, Christianity is primarily an adventure in coöperation — it is to show to the world that when the Spirit of Christ is in the hearts of people, people will get along together and work for higher idealism. But a hundred other things are substituted for the primary purpose of Christianity and so we go stumbling along entangled and bewildered. It ought not to be so. Life is too serious for such folly to be paraded among the followers of Jesus as having in it some virtue. There is no virtue in one group of Christians staying away from another group. To refuse to go along with a group of Christians whose theological views differ condemns those who withdraw rather than those from whom they withdraw. Our hope lies in the finer thinking of an oncoming generation.

P. A.

BISHOP GORE'S PHILOSOPHY OF THE GOOD LIFE

By Rev. Arthur B. Kinsolving, D.D.
Rector of Saint Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Baltimore, Md.

I HAVE in mind to review some of the salient features of Bishop Gore's Gifford Lectures before the University of St. Andrews during the winter of 1929-30, one of the greatest religious books which has appeared in recent years. As is known, Charles Gore, now a man of seventy-five, has perhaps the longest list of really notable books to his credit of any clergyman in England. Dean Inge, the leader of a different school, said lately, "Bishop Gore is the strongest man in the English church." He first became known to a wider public as the editor of *Lux Mundi*, in 1889, a series of studies in the religion of the incarnation. Then in 1891 he gave the Bampton Lectures on *The Incarnation of the Son of God*. Next he published *The Body of Christ* and *The New Theology and the Old Religion*. Then, passing over other titles, he produced three books, a trilogy, *God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit and the Church*. Only two years ago, under his editorship, appeared a very remarkable commentary in one volume on the whole Bible, including the Apocrypha.

This work, *The Philosophy of the Good Life*, is an attempt to meet the two notable rebellions to-day against all the moral standards which invoke ancient authority in different lands. He says, "These rebellions

are of two kinds. There are the rebels against the actual moral standard of Christianity, such as were Voltaire and Rousseau, and Goethe in a milder form, and, in a much more revolutionary form, Nietzsche and a good many contemporary writers. And there are the rebels who, claiming to retain the tradition of moral standards in practice, believe that this can be done while placing it on a quite new basis of intellectual presuppositions — such as are to be found among materialists, positivists, and agnostics, and also among idealists."

The range of citation in this volume gives evidence that Bishop Gore is to a very rare degree the master of the related literature. The book is no patchwork of quoted authorities, but rather a masterful marshaling of the deepest thought of the strongest thinkers and specialists in many departments of knowledge, as these thoughts throw light upon the great central theme of the good life.

He goes back to the wonderful teachings of Zarathustra and the ancient metrical hymns, the Gathas, dating he thinks around 1,000 B.C. Zoroaster is the corrupt Greek form of the Iranian Zarathustra. One of the most remarkable of all the earlier sages of the world, Zarathustra belonged to a pastoral community subject to constant assaults and outrages from Turanian freebooters. The strain of these attacks and the struggle of a peace-loving, pastoral people against the violent and aggressive nomads symbolizes to Zarathustra the world-wide struggle of good against evil, the almost desperate struggle of the feeble good in the world against overwhelming evil. The wail of the kine goes up to the divine being or beings. Zarathustra feels a call to inter-

pose as a prophet, so he cries, "For whom did ye fashion me? Who created me?" "Destruction is not intended for the right living, nor for the tender cattle at the hands of the liars." Then Zarathustra pleads for divine assistance, and stands forth as God's champion and servant. The teaching as presented in the Gathas is that life, in spite of all the evils which beset it, in spite of its enormous abuses, is a good thing, of eternal, immeasuarble worth. There is a good purpose running through creation, though there are many adversaries. The supreme Lord Wisdom, the creator and final judge, is the only god to be worshiped, and is one day to come into his own in his whole creation. Man's vocation is to put his whole self, body and soul, thought, word and deed, at the service of the holy Wisdom by prayer and work, by living the peaceful, beneficent life, by loving truth and peace, but also by fighting hard against the followers of the Lie. There is no way of fellowship with God by charms or sacrifices, but only by the way of likeness to God. We know God's character of truth and justice, purity, goodness and pity, and can live according to his spirit in the certainty of the final day of infallible judgment with its eternal issues.

Here is a theory of the good life for man in fellowship with God quite distinct, even as discerned through the mist of the ages. We shall see later how sharply it stands contrasted with Buddhism.

Judaism was at first a national religion. Christianity, which in one aspect is the flowering of Judaism, is a universal religion. Zoroastrianism is at its start universal, and for both the essence of the good life for man is correspendonce with the purpose and character of God.

In the Buddhism of India, Dr. Gore finds, as other scholars have, a profound pessimism of outlook. The doctrine of Karma, which has seized and possessed the soul of India, is deeply hostile to the formation of any firm idea of the good life for man. It undermines and weakens disastrously the sense of personal responsibility and of social responsibility alike, and makes a man think of his life as the bearing of a penance laid upon him by an irresistible fate, the inevitable resultant of unknown crimes committed by unknown persons in previous states of existence.

Gotama was the son of a chieftain, and was born about 540 B. C., not far from Benares. He was brought up in luxury and sensual indulgence, and at twenty-nine, filled with disgust of existence, kissed his wife and child good-bye and left his home forever. He sought the wisest philosophers, tried the most strenuous asceticism under five famous masters, and reached the conclusion that human happiness is attained only through the death of desire.

The central heresy in Buddha's eyes was the heresy of individuality. He repudiated all the science of his time, all astronomy, geography, and knowledge. There are various traditions issuing out of the original Buddhism, but that which vitiates it always at the core is the fundamental principle of its founder that personal life is an evil, not a good.

As to Hinduism, Dr. Gore accepts the verdict of most modern scholars that it is not one religion or one faith, but a jumble of all the religions that have swept through the land during the course of ages. It embraces polytheism, monotheism, pantheism, and atheism, each

of which has flourished under its name at different times, and this is its weakness. From the vilest forms of worship, with the foulest imaginations of immorality, to the sublimest heights of philosophic thought, this strange medley presents a queer assortment of phenomena, and in spite of the claim of many writers to-day that we of the west should find a new spiritual home in Hindu thought, there seems no stable foundation for ethics either in Buddhism or Hinduism. Writes Dr. Gore: "We have to accept the fact that, almost all the world over, the 'natural religions' are ceremonial and non-ethical. They are divorced from morality, and often positively immoral. So it was and is in India."

The great Chinese sages, Confucius, Mencius, who gave Confucianism its final expression, and Lao-tze, were optimists. They emphasized the natural goodness of human nature, and claimed that benevolence, righteousness, propriety, and knowledge are not infused into us by external influences, but that we are furnished with them. Confucius was one who loved and lived by the eternal virtues, justice, truth, self-control, kindness, faithfulness, and courage. The duties of children to their parents is the fountain whence all other virtues proceed. To-day Confucianism, for all its virtues, appears to be so bound up with a vanished regime that it does not seem likely to be of much avail for the establishment of a new order. Yet it would appear to us that the contrasts between the fundamental constructiveness and hopefulness of Confucianism and the pessimism of the religion of Gotama appear vividly in the destinies of India and China.

Dr. Gore's review of the religion of Muhammad, arising in Arabia in the seventh century, is very striking. No one can ignore the prophet's supreme genius as a master of men. When he first became conscious of his mission as the messenger of the one God to suppress idolatry among the Arab tribes, Islam swallowed up a great part of a divided and corrupted Christendom, and became the most serious menace and rival to Christianity of all the religions of the world. Muhammad was deeply influenced at the beginning of his mission by both Judaism and Christianity. His religion is far below the theology and morality of Judaism at its best, and certainly can not be compared with the Christianity of the New Testament. Muhammad had a very shrewd perception of what the Arabs, with whom he was primarily concerned, would be content to do or refuse to do. So he centered his creed and practice in these five duties: (1) the recital of the confession of faith; (2) the recital of the set prayers; (3) the fast of Ramadan; (4) almsgiving; (5) the pilgrimage to Mecca; duties which were definite organization duties, but would involve no deep transformation of character. The author sees the success of Islam as a rival to Christianity largely due to its incorporation of weak races into a world-wide fellowship. The principle of catholic fellowship was inherent in Christianity at the start, but as Africans have seen it exemplified in Europe, it has been scandalously exclusive, national, and often hostile.

We will touch lightly upon his review of the systems of Greece, because these are more familiar to us. Socrates was looked upon by his contemporaries often as an unsettling questioner, believing himself to have a divine

vocation to examine men. He described himself as the midwife of the intellect, whose business it was to bring to the birth something latent but innate in the intelligence of ordinary men. The most lifelike, brilliant and fascinating picture of Socrates that we possess is given us by Plato (427-347 B.C.). There is no greater literature in the world, perhaps, than these Dialogues. Socrates remained in memory the ideal wise man, just as Plotinus did later among the Neo-Platonists. Socrates taught that the moral values, goodness, truth, beauty, are realities eternal and divine behind all the varieties and fluctuations of opinion, and that it is the salvation of the soul to live according to these eternal principles. From Heracleitus he learned to appreciate the changing character of sensation and opinion, and contrasted it with the other realm of stable reality. "The name of Plato is perhaps the grandest name in the history of philosophy and, in particular, of moral philosophy, and Platonism has been so permanent and ennobling an influence on the life and thought of mankind that criticism of him seems almost irreverent. In fact, however, his immediate influence on the ethical life of Greece does not seem to have been considerable." It was through Zeno, the founder of Stoicism, and the later fusion of Platonism with Stoicism that the power of Plato's idealism made itself felt as a master influence in fashioning the individual. Zeno (350-260 B.C.), a Phœnician by race, held that a man can attain to perfect tranquility of mind, accepting indifferently all accidents as being the will of God, and rising superior to all doubt or fear or preference of pleasure to pain. The Stoics believed that the soul survived death, but that there

could be no immortality for the individual. The destiny of all individual souls, "fragments" of the one divine fire, would be reabsorption into their source. Without question the Platonic and Stoic conception of the eternal law of right and wrong has made a profound impression in the evolution of modern Europe.

We come now to Israel. The good life based upon religion was the one absorbing quest in Israel. Their religion was ethical through and through, and not primarily ritualistic. At first we hear fierce denunciations of idolatry, doubtless due to their abhorrence of the corrupt religions around them which were morally worthless. Later, under the guidance of Deuteronomy and such prophets as Ezekiel, a synthesis was effected between the sacrificial cultus and the ethical religion of the prophets. In many of the psalms, especially the psalms of the sanctuary, we find the highest spirituality associated with the worship of the temple. Later still appears the influence of the Scribes and Pharisees, who opposed fiercely the priest kings, until in time the Sadducean family, who occupied the priesthood, had charge of the temple. The Pharisees, while they observed the sacrificial rites, centered in the synagogue worship rather than the temple.

There is no such absoluteness of statement about God to be found in Zoroaster or in Plato as we have in the religion of Israel. Moreover, the prophets declare not their own reasoning but the word of God. This supreme and transcendent God is absolutely righteous, and it is righteousness that he demands of men, and no magical or costly sacrifices can induce him to depart in his judgment from perfect righteousness. That

righteousness must show itself in judgment on sin, because sin is rebellion against God; but God has no pleasure in condemning. His righteousness is love — a love greater than that of a mother for her child, or a husband for a wife.

From Amos onward God is the God of all the earth, and all men are called to be just and merciful like God, or else to suffer punishment. There is within Israel also a beautiful sense of the mercy of God as a constant element in his righteousness, requiring a like mercy in man toward his fellowman.

It is impossible in the brief time remaining to do more than make a condensed and partial digest of the last six chapters in this book, in which the author deals with Jesus Christ. Jesus of Nazareth was by origin and training purely a "child of Israel," uninfluenced by Hellenistic civilization. The new point in his preaching was the announcement of the kingdom of God. At the beginning in Galilee only the goodness of the tidings is in evidence. Here is a prophet who loves and cares for poor, oppressed people, has authority over diseases, over the spirits of evil and the forces of nature, and who spake as never man spake. But the first enthusiastic response is not deep enough for his purpose. Many came to hear and be healed, but there were few disciples. So he concentrated his attention on fashioning a new Israel, the true church of God. Israel in the mass would reject him and be judged. So he would fulfil the role of the suffering servant in the later Isaiah. Then there follows this balanced and, it seems to us, fairminded passage: "If Jesus was the wise founder of a visible society destined to play the central part in God's pur-

pose for the world, we should naturally expect that he would occupy himself greatly with its organization. We find, however, that he did this, in the sense which the words would ordinarily carry, very little. In one important matter, the matter of marriage, he appears to have laid down an explicit law, as St. Paul, St. Mark, and St. Luke report; but in the ordinary sense he was not a legislator. He did nothing at all comparable to what Plato did in his "laws" for his ideal community. As he refrained from dogmatic statements or theological definitions, so he refrained from legislative enactments. He proposed, it appeared, to inspire his church (in a most realistic sense) with his Spirit; and to leave it to the church to deal with issues as they should arise with the assistance of this divine Paraclete, the agent or representative of God.

"Nevertheless, a certain rudimentary organization he did give his society. He appointed officers in the persons of the twelve apostles, and he gave them authority such as the scribes had held in old Israel and had misused — to 'bind' and 'loose,' that is, to legislate by prohibition or permission, and to absolve or retain sins, that is, to exercise discipline over individuals; and he described such a ministry as a permanent feature in his household till he should 'come again.' Also he gave his society two rites at any rate, a rite of initiation (baptism) and a rite of fellowship (the holy communion). The evidence of St. Paul's epistles and of the Acts raises it, it seems to me, above all reasonable suspicion that the church from the very beginning of its history believed itself to have been endowed by Christ with these institutions and authoritative commissions, and this gives us the best

reason for accepting the narratives in the Gospels which record their institution or imply them."

Dr. Gore says that the good life, as taught by Jesus, was based upon a specific idea of God and his purposes. The novelty in his teaching about God lay in the emphasis upon his fatherhood. Fatherhood means that God will do his utmost for his sons. He will search for each one, follow, welcome him home. In the regard of Jesus, humanity is undoubtedly a fallen being (though he never refers to the garden of Eden) needing in every individual repentance and a new birth. But the sin which enslaves man is not in his body, but lies simply in the perverted will. Out of the heart of man proceed adulteries, thefts, etc. As all the world knows, Jesus found the summary of the divine law in the two great commandments, love to God and love toward man. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one toward another." Jesus says little to satisfy men's greedy curiosity about the life beyond. He does affirm the resurrection of the individual and judgment upon him according to his works. Jesus had a profound contempt for majorities. It was a theocracy he was founding, though with God brought closer to men. In respect of the general society amidst which it was to live, it was a kingdom within a kingdom, an aristocracy, representing the true humanity of sonship to God and brotherhood among men, an aristocracy in which humility and charity hold the first place. Before his death Jesus had sought to fill his disciples' minds with the expectation of the gift of the holy Spirit, a chief object of his coming, and some ten days after he had disappeared, the first outpouring of that gift came

upon the original group of brethren, the Spirit of God, who was also the Spirit of Jesus.

Our author has a great chapter on the Christian idea of God, showing the necessity of ascribing personality to God, and the ineffectualness of the ideas of pantheistic monism, pluralism, dualism, and the idea of emergent evolution. The emphasis of Otto and Karl Barth on the "otherness" of God must be corrected by the recognition of his immanence. Again, not only does moral conscience postulate the oneness of God, physical science also does. "The stellar system," says Eddington, "is one great organization," and he adds, "a universe organized on a rational plan . . . involves the priority of one rational mind."

The author then comes to deal with the trinity, that is, the Christian experience of redemption by the Father through the Son and in the Spirit. God was not to be thought of as one eternally solitary person. The Supreme One involves relationship and reciprocity within himself. There can be no love which is not the love of person for person. Prior to all creation, he is alive with a full life of will and thought and love. It was never pretended that such a thought of God could have come by human insight. It was implicit in the actual experience which the apostles had of the divine redemption through Jesus Christ.

There is a profound chapter on the Christian idea of human nature, on the responsibility involved in freedom of choice. The following sentence seems to answer a lot of the mechanistic reasoning of to-day: "The most elaborate machine is not really more 'autonomous' than a spade or a flint knife. We blame the maker, not the

machine, if it fails." He notes that the idea and reality of moral obligation is essentially bound up with the idea and reality of freedom. The Greek fathers insisted on the reality of free will and moral responsibility. Augustine, fighting Pelagianism, persuaded the Western church to adopt in part the idea of divine predestination. "But to-day the extremer Augustinianism, and its daughter, Calvinism, are being frowned out of court by theologians from all quarters — even from Scotland."

Then comes the section on the idea of divine revelation. "If we consider the history of Zarathustra, Muhammad, of Israel's prophets and of Jesus of Nazareth, the strongest and highest convictions concerning God have been ascribed by the prophets not to their own discovery but to the direct action of God, disclosing himself to the individual prophet." The prophet assumes that there exists in the souls of his fellowmen a faculty for recognizing the authority of the message. "Man's conscience is the lamp of the eternal, flashing into his inmost soul" (this is Moffat's translation of a verse from Proverbs); or, as Seneca says, "a holy spirit residing in us, the guardian and observer of our good and evil deeds." Jesus of Nazareth speaks about God in a tone of such confident authority that no one of us is prepared to face him and say, "I dispute this conclusion of yours as based on insufficient evidence. I do not believe that you know any more about God than I or any other man." We can not listen to Christ's words without feeling that God is speaking to us through him. And yet we must recognize that a divine word and the most objectively conceived gifts of divine grace must be thought of as coöperating with the human soul from within.

Christianity supersedes other religions not by excluding but by including the elements of truth which they all contain. It does claim to be final.

In the concluding chapter of the book, entitled "Rational Faith," the author speaks of the function of faith in knowledge, as well as in religion. He says that Dr. Tennant, quoting the definition of faith in Hebrews as "the substantiation of things hoped for, the assurance of things not seen," is giving a definition on which science works; and that when Bishop Butler said, "Probability is the guide of life," his assertion is quite as true of science. He says further that "the majority of the representatives of science would not be perturbed at hearing that science walks by faith and can not give a demonstrable, but only a reasonable, reason for the hope that is in it." St. Paul says, "We know in part, we see but in a glass darkly." Professor Eddington says, if you leave scientific men conversing on special problems or the latest discoveries, and return to them an hour later, you are likely to find them discussing the desperate state of their ignorance. In other words, the sentence from Ecclesiastes seems verified, "I found that man is unable to grasp the truth of all that God does in the world." "The greatest masters of knowledge will always be found acknowledging that the vision of the whole in any adequate sense is something very far above their attainments."

This noble study of the deepest motives and foundations of religion in its most signal manifestations during the past three thousand years, coming as it does out of the mature thought and study of one of the foremost scholars of the world, is a gift to Christian

men of this generation of very high value. It is not often we find brought together the vast equipment of a comprehensive knowledge of the related literature and a method so thoroughly open-eyed and modern. Near the end of the book the author writes as follows: "The ideal of 'reasonableness' is then a reasonable faith, which welcomes all the light it can get from any quarter, which is enthusiastic for the liberty of enquiring in all directions, which could not tolerate rejection of anything that can make a valid claim to be called knowledge, on account of moral or religious scruples or prejudices, but yet recognizes faith as the very foundation of reason and the central light of the soul. And this reasonable faith finds its fullest satisfaction in the acceptance of Jesus Christ as the very word of God incarnate. This is my witness and my contention. . . . The world is a dark place in many aspects, and life remains a perplexing experience; but man has got quite enough light to live by, even gloriously and thankfully, if we will walk by reason, recognizing that faith is a primary and constant constituent of reason; and that faith in a divine helper and friend may become for each of us an experience and a practical certitude . . . destined to pass into open vision."

ARTHUR B. KINSOLVING.

THE APPEAL OF YESTERDAY TO THE BIBLE

By Dr. W. J. Lhamon
Former Dean of Drury College, Springfield, Missouri

WE are four full centuries from the days of Luther. During this period the Protestant appeal has been to the Bible as the full and final rule of faith and practice. In the face of this appeal there have appeared more than two hundred Protestant sects—a new one on the average every two years! Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, John Wesley, John Robinson, William Ellery Channing, George Fox and Alexander Campbell, each made a direct appeal to the Bible and based his teachings on it. Yet Luther refused his hand to Zwingli when they differed about the Lord's supper, John Wesley and John Calvin were at opposite theological extremes, and Alexander Campbell could not stay in either the Baptist or Presbyterian church. As based on the Bible the churches should, theoretically, all be one. Actually we have hundreds of varieties of churchly belief ranging all the way from strict Calvinism to broad Arminianism; from orthodox high churchism to the vagaries of Christian scienceism; from fourth century trinitarianism to twentieth century unitarianism; and from strict sacramentalism to mystical quietism and Quakerism. Within these major cleavages there are minor ones, and within these again still smaller ones in an endless, puzzling procession. The

logic of consequences is squarely before us. We may still affirm and broadcast it to the world that "the Bible is the religion of Protestants;" but why has it not united them?

Something is wrong. The fault is not in the Bible. It is in our misconception of it, our misinterpretations of it, and our consequent misuse of it. In relation to the Bible of four Protestant centuries are the traditional heirs of preceding centuries. Roman Catholicism maintains the infallibility of the Bible but guards its interpretation by an infallible church. The reformers of the sixteenth century accepted this dogma of an infallible book and then proceeded to interpret it each pretty much in his own way. R. W. Dale of England is quoted by the late Dr. Henry Churchill King as saying of the reformers: "Their method was still powerfully influenced by the decaying scholasticism. There were other causes which gave to their work a provisional character. Indeed all work of this kind is but for a time; it has to be done over again whenever any great changes have taken place in the intellectual conditions of Christendom. Such changes have been going in very rapidly during the last three hundred years." And one may add, more rapidly during the last fifty years. We can no longer accept the dogma of infallibility either in the Bible or anywhere else. It is not a human trait. And if it should be handed to us from a divine source we would immediately spoil it by our fallible use of it. We live in a world of change and growth, and of approximations to truth, and what we need is not infallibility handed to us in sealed packages but guidance and inspiration for this or that day of

experience. In his promise to his disciples of the Holy Spirit the Master said, "He shall *guide* you into all truth." The Bible has become more precious to us than it could have been to the pioneers of the Reformation and their immediate heirs because we have discovered the human elements in it side by side with the divine. And that has opened the way for valuations of its different parts, for it is not a level book. There are high mountains and very low valleys in it. To our relief we have discovered in the Old testament a progressive disclosure of God; he grows from a local, tribal God of battles and victories, pleased and placated by incense and the smell of sacrifices—he grows from that into the God of peace, ethical and spiritual and careless of sacrifices, and adored by such great souls as Amos and Hosea and Isaiah and Micah. He grows till we find him in the thought and love of Jesus, the spiritual Father of all men. The claim of perfection, of inerrancy, and of infallibility is one of the heaviest burdens Christianity has had to bear. Backed by dogmatism it has been the source of unbrotherliness, bigotry, sectarianism, and persecution. Jesus knew best. He set a little child in the midst of his diciples as an emblem of his kingdom. In that there was no semblance of infallibility; quite the contrary. But there was wonredful sweetness, and equally wonderful possibilities of change and growth and approximations of divine character.

Another inherited misconception of the Bible is that it is constitutional, legislative, and prescriptive. There is a large body of legislation in the Old Testament because it comprises the history and literature of

a group of tribes that coalesced into a nation. But there are also in it, as the literature of a nation, history and poetry and fiction and philosophy in large measures. In the New Testament there is no legislation. There are biography and history and commission and exhortation and precedent. To the young churches of the first generation of Christians there is epistolary guidance, exhortation and rebuke. But there is no legislation. There is in it nothing of a constitutional nature. It comes to us as the plastic, incipient literature of an incipient, and growing and changing group of churches. To mistake its exhortations for legislation, and its precedents for static and divine prescriptions is an egregious fallacy of interpretation. However, that was the all but invaluable fallacy of the reformers. "Calvin," says Rev. Archibald Main in his *History of the Reformation,* "like other reformers of his age, made Holy Scripture the standard of doctrine and life, but he went further than Luther and made it the complete oracle of the Reformed church. The Bible in the Old and New Testaments was the seat of an infallible authority. No polity, no rite, no ethical precept was proper if it could not find scriptural sanction. Calvinism, therefore, was apt to favor a legalism that could be justified by biblical texts rather than the spirit of a living gospel. Judaism was too often wrought into the substance of a Christianity that claimed to be free from oppression—in a measure it crept into the place of a discarded scholasticism." Luther discounted reason in favor of faith in the Bible. He said in his jaunty, battle-axe kind of way, "Reason is the mistress of the devil; God's bitterest enemy. Faith wrings the neck of

reason and strangles the beast, which else the whole world could not strangle. But how? It holds to God's word and lets it be right and true, no matter how foolish and impossible it sounds." Zwingli applied to the doctrine and worship and organization of the church "that primal, classic charter, the Scriptures." The Thirty-nine Articles of the church of England affirm that, "The Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor can be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." John Wesley carried this over from the church of England into the Methodist movement. And in general Protestantism during a period of more than three hundred years has built theoretically on the Bible thus misconceived both as to its content and its function.

From the first also Protestantism inherited from the mediæval church a spirit of dogmatism that is now thoroughly discredited in the foremost circles of thought. That spirit has been (and is yet to some extent) a disrupting force. Dr. E. C. Moore in his *History of Protestant Thought* since Kant summarizes the disturbing influences of Protestant dogmatism in a significant and compact paragraph. He says, "There is a remarkable unity in the history of Protestant thought in the period from the Reformation to the end of the eighteenth century. There is a still more surprising unity of Protestant thought in this period with the thought of the mediæval and ancient church. The basis and methods are the same. Upon many points the conclusions are identical. There was nothing of which the

Protestant scholastics were more proud than of their agreement with the Fathers of the early church. They did not perceive in how large a degree they were one with the Christian thinkers of the Roman communion as well. Few seem to realize how largely Catholic in principle Protestant thought has been. The fundamental principles at the basis of the reasoning have been the same. The notions of inspiration and revelation were identical. The idea of authority was common to both, only the instance in which that authority is lodged was different. The thoughts of God and man, of the world, of creation, of providence and prayer, of the nature and means of salvation, are similar. Newman was right in discovering that from the first he had thought, only and always, in what he called Catholic terms."

In all this the early nineteenth century was not different from the eighteenth. Its thought forms were mediæval and Roman Catholic. Its insistence on dogmas; its claims of authority; and of inerrancy and infallibility, were all an inheritance that Protestantism took over from Roman Catholicism. Such forces can function for unity only where individuality, intelligence, freedom and conscience are suppressed. The tragedy of Protestantism has been the conflict between intelligence and conscience on the one hand and dogmatism and authority on the other. Either intelligence must be abandoned in favor of authority, or authority in favor of intelligence before Christian unity can be a reality. In an age of colleges and universities, of laboratories and museums, of science and history and literature, intelligence will not be given up. It is possible

that we may recover from our mistaken, inherited hunger for authority — such authority as inheres in institutions, dogmas, and assumptions of inerrancy, infallibility, finality and fixedness.

The cure for all the above may be found (must be found) in modern scholarship. We must turn to the critics — as unfortunately they are called; the textual critics, and the historical and literary ones; in a word, the specialists in biblical and religious studies. It is they who seek to know exactly what the Bible is and what its values and uses are. Real scholars are without sectarian predilections. They are dominated by the academic spirit and the scientific motive. In their love of truth and their sincere search for it, biblical scholars belong in the class with astronomers, geologists, chemists, linguists, and historians. With the scholar prejudices must be thrown to the discard; traditions must be sifted; and dogmas discounted. With the scholar facts are at a premium and truth is minted gold. It is biblical scholarship that gives us hope of salvation from our sectarianism. Without it we must go crippling on in our traditional, denominational ways, with, possibly, our confusion worse confounded.

Scholarship has disclosed several facts about the Bible that must be taken into account by wise advocates of Christian union. For one thing it has shown us that the Bible is as distinctly human on the one hand as it is divine on the other. The stream of inspiration has come to us through "earthen vessels." The individual writers were inspired each according to his capacity, and each according to the needs of his age. They do not always harmonize. They differ in theological view-

point, in ethical emphasis, and in attitude toward laws and institutions and sacramental forms. They were subject to the thought-forms of their times and they were under the stern law of adaptation in their teachings to the conditions of their times. Their teachings, therefore, cannot be used categorically and finally under the thought-forms and conditions of our day, but they are invaluable for historical suggestion and as fountains of spiritual power,

Again it is to modern biblical scholarship that we owe the vast change from static to developmental concepts of biblical history and inspiration and revelation. The progressive disclosure of God was spoken of above. One passes from the early tribal notions of God as an anthropomorphic super-man to the sublime conception of Isaiah's trishagion, the "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty." There is nothing better coming to us out of the pre-Christian centuries than the lofty ethical monotheism of the later prophets. Jesus seizes on that as the best his people had to give and transmutes it into paternal monotheism. To Jesus God is Father. And the term is more than a metaphor. It is a constructive concept. Jesus builds on it. His own life and teachings proceed from it. With him the human and divine are inter-related, and that very closely: The Being whom Jesus discloses to us as Father is immanent spirit kindling our spirits. In his Fatherliness he is

> "Nearer to us than breathing
> And closer than hands and feet."

He works without regard to days. He clothes the lilies, feeds the sparrows and cares for the vineyards on a

thousand hill-sides. He loves his children and runs to meet returning, repentant prodigals. The later prophets could not think of God as their tribesmen ancestors did two thousand years before. Their deeper experience and broader civilized life forbade it. And Jesus could not think of God just as his people did though they had been taught by Amos and Hosea and Isaiah and Jeremiah. Christian union must be based on the paternal theology of Jesus and not on the monarchical theology predominant in the Old Testament. For this reason the relation of the Old Testament to the question of Christian union cannot be a vital one. The man who follows Jesus intelligently feels himself absolved from the state-church legislation, the altar forms of worship, the governmental concepts and the ethnic limitations of the Old Testament.

As to the New Testament. During a period of two hundred years the church was without the authorized New Testament canon. During the early centuries, while the mother church was producing the book, she was under the guidance of the Spirit of God and of the risen Savior, and she was united. She was not divided till her sons began to use the book as a law and an authority in the construction of dogma. Then the trouble began. It is a long-lived calamity that the sweetest, most entrancing, most dynamic body of literature ever produced by the inspired souls of men should have been degraded into an arsenal of authoritative texts to be used like so many shields and spears and swords in wordy battles over sectarian whims. A vast deal of the sectarianism of to-day can be traced to no other source than the traditional and untaught misuse

of the New Testament. Original Christianity was not a book religion, and before Christians can unite the New Testament must be restored to its original functions of witnessing, of guidance, and of inspiration. It must be taken away from the dogmatists and the legalists, and it must be given back to the real disciples of Christ as a help to their continued discipleship, and to the lovers of Christ as an inspiration to their growing love.

The appeal of yesterday to the Bible as the basis of Christian union cannot stand. It is an antiquated appeal. Calvin's views of the Bible will not do for us, for we cannot see it with Calvin's eyes. Nor can we see it with the eyes of Rome, or Augsburg, or Westminster; or with those of Cotton Mather or Alexander Campbell. We must still appeal to the Bible but it must be to *our* Bible, that is, the Bible as the most recent research and the most candid scholarship reveals it to us.

W. J. LHAMON.

THE DIE

It was an hour for silver words,
For every trick of tone and plea;
He took a loaf and wine, and said,
This do in memory of me.

And still are those who wonder why
There was no more to do or say,
But sing a song and then go out
To watch a while and sweat and pray.

—Arthur R. McDougall, Jr.

THE CHRISTIAN UNITY WE NOW HAVE

By Rev. Thomas F. Opie, D.D.
Protestant Episcopal Church, Olney, Maryland

ONE significant feature of the Lausanne conference was that it disclosed our common denominational loyalty to Jesus. All Christians are practically at one in allegiance to him — and of course, whatever further and future unity we shall attain in coming generations, must be based on Jesus, as a starting point. This leads to the assertion that if and when the denominations make Christ the only *sine qua non* of church membership, we shall indeed have Christian unity! And it is exceedingly doubtful if unity will or can ever come until this simple matter of "what constitutes" a "Christian" resolves itself into simple allegiance to Jesus—instead of resolving itself into allegiance to scores of differentiated standards set up by denominations—which standards actually make "denominationalists"—Episcopalians, Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, etc., rather than Christians.

Not only have we this oneness in Jesus—but as was recently pointed out in an editorial in the *Federal Council Bulletin,* we all have a common heritage and a unity in our devotional literature—not alone in the Bible, which is our common possesion, but in a sort of interdenominationalism of hymnology: Although a bishop of the Episcopal church wrote, "O Little Town

of Bethlehem"—this exquisite Christians hymn is sung with equal appreciation and devotion by all Christian communions. This is true also of "Jesus, Lover of My Soul", written by a Methodist; "O Love That Wilt Not Let Me Go", written by a Presbyterian; "Dear Lord and Father of Mankind", written by a Quaker; "O Master, Let Me Walk With Thee", written by a Congregationalist, We are at one in our use and appreciation of these and many other inspiring hymns common to all Christian groups.

Of course there is also a community of Christian character, of Christian scholarship, of Christian social idealism. And these should not be overlooked. Further, there is a real and extensive unity on the part of many of the Protestant bodies. A Christian in the Presbyterian church, is recognized as a Christian in the Congregational church — and vice versa. So is a Christian in the Methodist churches recognized as a Christian in these two other folds. They are at liberty to go from one to another indifferently and are received on an equal footing—both in the pew and in the pulpit. Almost any Presbyterian minister may go into any Methodist, or Congregational church, on the basis of free fraternity and of equality before God. He can minister in these churches and the layman is at liberty to worship in them, without question or prejudice. The layman may come to the table of the Lord in any of these folds and there is a general exchange of Christian fellowship, on the basis of equality. This is a fact that ought not to be belittled—and that certainly ought not to be overlooked.

In the writer's judgment, we now have Christian

unity of a very real and vital kind—*but for two things.* I regret to say that one of these two things inheres in my own group (Protestant Episcopal) — while the other inheres in the Baptist and Disciple groups. One is, needless to say, confirmation and the other is immersion.

If I, a Christian, wish to attend service in any of the Protestant churches, I may do so—and the fact that I came to Christ via the Episcopal route does not hinder me. And I may be received into membership in many of these churches, without making re-avowal to a new set of tenets and tests! But, to be recognized as a real Christian on the basis of equality before God in a Baptist or Disciple church, I must submit to another form than the one which has made me a Christian in Episcopal style! So must a Presbyterian and a Congregationalist! And if a Baptist or Disciple Christian wishes to be recognized in the Episcopal fold, on the basis of equality before God — he must submit to another form than the one which has already made him a Christian in his own group! This is a farce. This is arrogance. It may be referred to in milder forms of expression — but it is actually hypocritical, pharisaical, unworthy — and silly, not to say utterly unwarranted and un-Christian.

If and when the time comes (and it is as inevitable as sun-rise) that any Christian person, made a Christian by way of baptism in the name of Jesus, by whatsoever Christian group, denomination or church, shall be privileged to go, *ad libitum,* into any and all Christian churches for worship, for fellowship, for participation in the sacrament of the Lord's supper—without ques-

tion and as a Christian before God—then we shall have a real and comprehensive sort of Christian unity: And when Christian ministers are recognized as Christian ministers and have free access to all Christian pulpits, we shall have a still more comprehensive unity. And this we now have—except for the two notable exceptions! The removal of these two exceptions and stumbling-blocks can be confidently forecast—as they are now beginning to crumble.

One of these two obstacles, that of confirmation as a *sine qua non* has already been given a shortening tenure of life. The Lambeth conference, which is made up of the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal faith throughout the world, has signed its death-warrant as a *sine qua non.* This is its sentence of doom (as an absolute requisite to Christian membership): "We recognize", say the bishops at Lambeth, "all persons who have been duly baptized with water in the name of the trinity *as sharing with us membership* in the holy Catholic church!" Very well, if all Presbyterians, Methodists, Lutherans, Congregationalists, Baptists, etc., by reason of their baptism (no matter by whom baptized) share membership in the church of Jesus Christ — who is it and what is it that debars them from Episcopal pulpits? from Episcopal pews? from Episcopal altars? what does the term "sharing membership with us" mean? If one is entitled to "membership," is he not entitled to "fellowship"? And if he has membership in a fellowship — why is he not recognized on the basis of equality before God and man as a Christian?

Now there is no need to abandon *confirmation*—nor is there any need to abandon *immersion!* Not at all!

But there is need and there is ample and sufficient reason to take both confirmation and immersion down from their high pedestals! That is, there is no longer any grounds for the contention that a Christian who has been neither immersed nor confirmed is not entitled to recognition the world over — and the church throughout — *as a Christian!* Let this fact be recognized — and we shall have Christian unity! These special forms may be treasured and may continue to be used and enjoyed by all who want and prefer them — but they must not be forced upon those who do not want and who do not prefer them! It must be admitted that Christians can be and are made by other methods than these!

With these two barriers down—Christian persons will be free to go from church to church—from communion table to altar—from pew to pew and from pulpit to pulpit, indifferently—or according to their volition and inclination. They will be recognized in all churches of the Protestant fold—and will be received in all groups, or in any group, without the humiliating process of being "de-Christianized" and then being "Christianized" immediately thereupon by another form or sectarian rite, ceremony or sacrament! This done, the old denominational loyalties and the old denominational names and nomenclature will fall gradually into disuse. There will be a rallying around the name of Jesus and a definite trend toward vital and complete solidarity, with a concert of effort to lift humanity and to introduce the kingdom of God on earth. There will be natural gravitation toward certain forms of worship and toward certain methods of procedure — toward certain modes and manners, as

tastes and temperaments demand on the part of given groups—but no longer must there be repudiation of other methods and manners! There need never be uniformity of belief—which is really undesirable and quite unnecessary. There need never be uniformity of forms of worship—which is also quite as undesirable and equally unecessary! But inevitably there will be a diminution of sectarian divisiveness, of denominational pride and prejudice and a corresponding strengthening of the common fellowship, together with a community of effort and a concert of mind.

But for two things we have Christian unity! It is now evidently the business of all special pleaders to desist and it is the business of all true Christians to sacrifice their party loyalties and to make paramount and abiding that higher loyalty to Christ, the head of the church. "The foundation is laid, namely, Jesus Christ—and no one can lay any other! Brothers, for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ I beg of you all to drop these party-cries. There must be no cliques among you; you must regain your common temper and attitude."

THOMAS F. OPIE. .

BALTIMORE'S YOUTH CONTRIBUTES TO RELIGIOUS UNITY

By E. Foster Dowell
President of the Federation of Church and Synagogue Youth, Baltimore, Maryland

A FEDERATION of eleven young people's organizations representing eight different religious groups constitutes Baltimore's most recent contribution to the cause of religious unity. The Federation of Church and Synagogue Youth was organized on Thursday, April 9th, 1931, and consists of Jewish Reformed, Methodist Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Disciples of Christ, Friends, Unitarians and Universalist youth. An adequate understanding of this federation requires a knowledge of (I) its origin, (II) its organization, (III) its reception by the Baltimore public, and (IV) what the attitude of its members betokens for its future success or failure.

I

For several years certain young people's groups in Baltimore had been sending their respective ministers and their leaders to speak at each other's devotional meetings. Out of such visits grew the conviction of these young people that they possessed so much in common that they should create a permanent organization devoted to the furtherance of their like religious interests from a point of view broader than that which

any one isolated group could ever hope to contribute. So, in the early spring a meeting of the representatives from eleven young people's societies was called in the parish house of the First Unitarian church. From this meeting sprang a series of luncheon gatherings which matured plans for the organization of a permanent federation.

As the result of these plans ten representatives of each of the eleven young people's groups and the ministers and rabbis and their wives from these eleven churches and synagogues met at six-thirty on the evening of April 9th. A buffet supper was served by the hosts, Rabbi Morris S. Lazaron, the ladies and young people of the Madison Avenue temple. In the meeting which followed, under the chairmanship of the Reverend F. Raymond Sturtevant, the spokesmen of the various groups present arose in rapid succession and heartily endorsed the idea of a federation. Three young men, Methodist, Unitarian and Jewish, gave brief talks, pointing out the need for religious unity, the methods of meeting this need and what could be hoped for from the proposed federation. These talks were very favorably received, and immediately afterwards, the constitution of the federation, carefully planned in advance, was introduced and adopted. Dr. Everett R. Clinchy, secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, had come from New York to deliver the address of the evening, a splendid plea for religious harmony and unity. At the conclusion of his address a committee consisting of one representative of each youth group present reported through its chairman, Theodore Baker, its nominations to fill the federation

offices created by the adoption of the constitution. The nominees were, upon a motion from the floor to that effect, unanimously elected. The officers thus chosen for the year 1931-32 are: E. Foster Dowell, president; Adolph Cohn, vice-president, and Marcus A. Tregor, secretary-treasurer.

II

The organization thus created consists of the federation officers, the executive committee of twenty-five, consisting of the three officers, one representative from each of the eleven member-groups and the eleven ministers and rabbis acting as advisors, and a membership of all the members of the eleven constituent young people's groups. No single person as such can become a member of the federation, but when a group is admitted all its members automatically become federation members. The officers are elected for a term of one year at the annual spring election of the federation, so no office may be held by a member of any one young people's group for more than one year at a time.

The executive committee is the important administrative and executive unit of the federation. Its members, with the exception of the three federation officers, are not elected by the federation but are chosen by their own young people's groups or ex-officio the representatives of the churches and synagogues as the ministers and rabbis. It arranges for all the meetings of the federation, appoints a nominating committee which presents nominations for the three federation offices, provides for the raising of such funds as the federation may need and conducts any other necessary business. Furthermore, new member-groups may only be ad-

mitted after having been nominated by two-thirds of this committee and all amendments to the constitution must be recommended by two-thirds of its members. The executive committee has met only twice since the constitution was adopted, but it has, within that time, organized three permanent sub-committees.

The program committee, Miles Eichhorn, chairman, has planned a fall meeting of the federation at the First Unitarian church, at which time a nationally prominent minister will speak in regard to religion and social amelioration. This will be followed by a survey or report by each group on some one phase of the topic. These surveys will extend until after the first of 1932. At that time the results of the surveys will be reported to the federation as a whole in meeting at Mt. Vernon Place Methodist Episcopal church, analyzed in smaller discussion groups, and then discussed on the floor of a full federation meeting.

The friendly relations committee, John Wheeler, chairman, aims to draw into closer contact and aid in every way possible the federation members. It furthers joint meetings of federation groups and visits among the various groups by the ministers and rabbis and federation officers. It will set an Interdenominational day when all the young people's groups in Baltimore will be asked to devote a meeting to the cause of religious unity. Its bureaus, the work of which will be done by a paid secretary, include a speaker's bureau which will send out federation speakers of both prominent men advocating religious unity and able young speakers of the federation; and an information bureau where a copy of the by-laws and a description of the organization of

each federation group will be kept along with a card index of the federation's membership.

The federation expansion committee, Grace Smith, chairman, keeps information regarding all of Baltimore's religions and denominations so that the federation may know the exact proportion between the number of denominations represented in its own ranks and those within the entire city. This committee will also make a survey of some of the vital problems in Baltimore which offer an opportunity to the federation to make its influence felt.

The churches and synagogues whose young people are charter members of the federation are: the Associate Congregational Church, Reverend Clifford W. Collins; the Christian Temple, Reverend Peter Ainslie; the Park Avenue Friends' Meeting, Reverend Bliss Forbush; the Madison Avenue Temple, Rabbi Morris S. Lazaron; the Oheb Shalom Synagogue, Rabbi William Rosenau; Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Reverend Fred C. Reynolds; Mt. Vernon Place Methodist Episcopal Church, Reverend Oscar T. Olson; Brown Memorial Presbyterian Church, Reverend T. Guthrie Speers; Roland Park Presbyterian Church, Reverend John R. Douglas; First Unitarian Church, Reverend F. Raymond Sturtevant; and the Universalist Church of Our Father, Reverend Hal T. Kearns.

III

The brief account just given of the history and structure of the federation omits one of the most significant facts,—the cordial, almost eager reception which it received from many phases of Baltimore life.

The business life, the political life, the academic life, and the young life of Baltimore all responded to the news of the federation's birth. Some examples of this response will probably be more informative than many pages of routine description or analysis.

The head of a Baltimore insurance company writes, "I had almost given up hope that the movement with which you are connected would bear fruit. I can endorse this because it has long represented my ideals. And religion will not be successful until these ideals are attained." The vanishing hope of an older generation at last seized up and revived and borne onward by the younger generation, is that not enough of a challenge to carry on this torch of religious unity that it may burn more brightly with the passing years?

Another episode has as its setting that *sine qua non* of American life, the corner drug-store. Into the store walked a Jewish friend of the young pharmacist there. In the course of the conversation he drew a printed leaflet from his pocket and said, "I brought this for you, it's something you ought to be interested in." The young pharmacist looked down and saw an account of one of the talks delivered at the Madison Avenue temple. The printed leaflet was the Temple bulletin. When the simple news of the organization of such a federation can draw Jew and Christian together in the corner drug-store in conversation over their common religious interests the battle is already half won.

Some of these responses took place at the most unexpected times. During a Baltimore election, a young Democratic politician, a member of the house of delegates of the Maryland Legislature walked into the

polling place and said to one of the Republican judges of election who happened to be one of the federation officers, "Well, I see by the paper that you are an officer in this interdenominational organization. That's fine. We need more of that and I want to congratulate you!" From our very legislative halls comes a realization of the need for such a movement.

The most interesting groups, perhaps, which were reached by the news of the federation's organization is found in Baltimore's leading university. In the cafeteria four graduate students are having lunch together, a Jew, a Christian who is very skeptical toward the church, another who believes in it, and a Chinese Christian. One of them is writing his doctoral dissertation on a subject dealing with the relation of church and state. The topic of conversation suddenly turns to the recent newspaper account of the federation. The Jewish student remarks, "Well, I don't believe in church much. I haven't gone for years, but that sort of thing is a move in the right direction." The others heartily assent and now this Jewish student wants to come to the federation meetings. That such an organization can, by its unusual nature, reach those not attracted to church or synagogue is one of its greatest opportunities and responsibilities.

One afternoon a member of the federation was visiting several friends who were Roman Catholics. After he had finished telling them of the new organization their first question was, "Aren't there any Catholics in it?" Whether their attitude in this matter was different than the official one of their church would be remains to be seen, but their question suggests a great, if not easily or soon attained goal.

Then there were telephone calls and messages from members of denominations not represented in the federation, young people, all of them. A request was received from a well-known mid-western university for a copy of the constitution and any additional information.

IV

So much for the birth and organization of the federation and its effect on the life of Baltimore. What does the spirit within the organization itself betoken as to its future success? The only federation meeting held so far was on the night of April 9th. At that time a great enthusiasm and eagerness was manifested. All the speakers were given a cordial reception and all measures, from the adoption of the constitution to the election of officers were speedily accomplished amid an atmosphere of universal satisfaction and approval. Since then the work of the federation has fallen into the hands of the executive committee and its sub-committees, which have initiated plans for a whole year's program within the space of two brief luncheon meetings.

Apparently three distinct principles have guided the policy of the executive committee. These are best described as youth, religious equality, and difference. First of all this is, as its title bears witness, a federation of youth. Youth desired it, youth planned it and organized it. Now youth must govern and operate it and be responsible for its ultimate success or failure. Secondly, religious equality is to prevail. Each denomination is allowed an equal number of member-groups in the federation. Each member-group contributes a like share to the financial support of the federation. Each

group's opinion and point of view is to be equally respected as such, no matter how few or great the number of its members. Finally, there is a distinct feeling that this is a unique group with a unique opportunity that must be met with clearness of mind and greatness of spitit. Its meetings must contribute something new and worthwhile in a new and worthwhile manner. Its work and plans must be outstanding as well as its speakers. The federation is a pioneer and must have a pioneer spirit.

Thus, the origin, organization, reception and spirit of the Federation of Church and Synagogue Youth augur well for its eventual success. But its future lies ahead, it is just launching its first year's program: Its enthusiastic declaration of good intentions and its hopeful plans have yet to be transmuted into accomplished facts by the alchemy of faithful and intelligent work. In this task which lies ahead one thing above all else will aid these young people, an encouraging response throughout the world from those who are believers in religious unity. The belief that it is working not for itself alone, but for a great world-wide cause will be the federation's greatest asset in this critical first year which lies just ahead over the horizon but as yet hidden from our sight.

E. Foster Dowell

THE COMMON HERITAGE OF THE CHURCH OF THE UNITED BRETHREN IN CHRIST AND THE EVANGELICAL CHURCH

By Professor Raymond W. Albright
Department of Church History in the Evangelical School of Theology, Reading, Pennsylvania

IT is almost impossible to state accurately just when either the church of the United Brethren in Christ or the Evangelical church had their beginning. It is commonly agreed that their beginnings were contemporaneous.

The date of September 25, 1800, when the first annual conference of the church of the United Brethren in Christ was held at the home of Peter Kemp in Frederick county, Maryland, is usually accepted as the beginning of this denomination as an organized movement.[1] Sometimes the earlier date 1766-8 is claimed since in this period Rev. P. W. Otterbein of the Reformed church in the United States heard a sermon by Rev. Martin Boehm, a Mennonite, in Long's barn, five miles northeast of Lancaster, Pennsylvania. Otterbein was so much impressed and moved by the sermon and so much in sympathy with Boehm's ideas that at the close of the service he embraced him and said, "We are brethren."[2]

1. Drury, A. W.—*History of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ*, Otterbein Press, Dayton, Ohio, 1924, p. 184.
2. Ibid, pp. 88-92.

The Evangelical church was organized at its first conference held November 3, 1803, probably at or near Kleinfeltersville, Pennsylvania. This denomination really began in 1800 when Jacob Albright, its founder, organized classes (small, widely scattered congregations) in eastern Pennsylvania.[3]

Since their very beginning there has been a very friendly relation between these churches. From 1813 to 1817 there was a definite movement for union into one denomination. Since 1922 these bodies have again been courting each other's favor, each sending fraternal delegates to the general conference of the other. Each church now has a committee on church merging and federation and in each the matter of a possible union of these bodies has been discussed with much favor. These committees of both churches have no authorization to make actual overtures during the present quadrennium, or the interim between the sessions of the General Conference, the highest governing body in each denomination.

Both bodies have had previous proposals for merging with other denominations. In 1809 a committee of the Baltimore conference of the Methodist church discussed the possibility of a church union with Bishop C. Newcomer of the United Brethren church.[4] The Methodist Protestant church proposed a union with the United Brethren in 1829-33 and again in 1913-17.[5] In 1855 an attempt was made to unite the Wesleyan Methodist and the United Brethren churches.[6] On August 2,

3. Orwig, W. W.—*History of the Evangelical Association,* Cleveland, Ohio, 1858, p. 21 f.
4. Drury, op. cit., p. 202 ff.
5. Ibid, pp. 541, 547, 548.
6. Ibid, p. 548.

1810, Bishop Francis Asbury and Rev. Henry Boehm of the Methodist church discussed church merging with Rev. John Dreisbach of the Evangelical church.[7] The attempt of the Methodist church to unite with both the United Brethren and the Evangelicals failed because in each case the Methodists insisted that there was no future for religious work in the German language.[5,7] Very often the Methodist church of that early period profited a great deal by receiving as members the children of the United Brethren and Evangelical families who learned to speak English or moved to a vicinity where their original church was not represented.

Both the United Brethren and the Evangelical churches were invited to unite with the Evangelical Synod of North America and the Reformed church in the United States to form the United Church in America in 1928-9. Early in the deliberations the Evangelical church withdrew and the other denominations have not consummated a union. Dr. George W. Richards of the Reformed church conceived the idea of the United Church in America using as the chief bond of union the common German ancestry of the membership of these churches. This movement failed largely because of the differences of polity, organization, and articles of faith among them.

Since throughout their entire history there has been such a close and friendly relationship between the United Brethren and the Evangelicals it is very fitting that one should study very carefully their common heritage and, if possible, derive or infer what advantages a union of these bodies would create.

---

7. Yeakel, Reuben—*History of the Evangelical Association*, Vol. I, Evangelical Press, Cleveland, Ohio, 1909 (earlier ed. 1894), p. 108.

Common Element of Time and Location

Whatever variable dates may be set for the organization of these bodies it must be recognized that their efforts were almost contemporaneous. They not only have a common heritage in respect to time but the nature of their work was very similar. Both churches were doing a religious work of a mystical, pietistic, and evangelistic nature.

The United Brethren and the Evangelical churches have the additional common heritage in that they were born in neighboring counties in eastern Pennsylvania, with similar social and religious environment, and this area has become a stronghold for each body. Although the first conference of the United Brethren was actually held in Maryland, just south of the Mason-Dixon line, their largest efforts after that were expended in Pennsylvania. Otterbein served parishes of the Reformed church in Lancaster; Tulpehocken (just a few miles from the spot where the Evangelical church was begun); Frederick, Maryland; York; and Baltimore. Jacob Albright's home was near Hinkletown, Pennsylvania, five miles due east of the Isaac Long barn. Kleinfeltersville, the widely accepted meeting place of the first Evangelical conference in 1803, is ten miles northeast of the Long barn, and about the same distance north of the Albright home.

Eastern Pennsylvania has remained a center for both of these denominations where they have a combined membership of approximately 50,000 east of the Susquehanna river. Both churches have many members in Lebanon, Harrisburg, Lancaster, and Reading. The resident bishops of the eastern areas of both churches

are located at Harrisburg. Here is also the eastern Publishing House of the Evangelical church. Lebanon Valley College of the United Brethren church is located at Annville and the Evangelical School of Theology and Albright College of the Evangelical church are located at Reading.

Common Experience of the Founders

Albright, Otterbein, and Boehm, the founders of these denominations, had in common a deep emotional experience of conversion which in each case developed a strong passion for righteousness and a desire to lead their companions and neighbors to a similar experience and way of life.

Philip William Otterbein (June 3, 1726-November 17, 1813) was born in Dillenburg, Germany, and prepared for the Reformed ministry at Herborn. Under the influence of Michael Schlatter he came to America as a missionary among the Germans of Pennsylvania. In August of 1752 Otterbein became the pastor of the Reformed church in Lancaster and had a very unusual experience here two years later. One of his hearers was convicted of sin under the influence of one of Otterbein's sermons. He asked Otterbein for advice and the preacher felt unprepared to advise another in sin. Otterbein prayed earnestly in private and came to a dynamic experience which gave him "the peace and joy of a conscious salvation and enlightenment in spiritual things."[8] Upon his return from Germany in 1771, Otterbein became pastor of the Independent Reformed church of Baltimore which later became a nucleus for the work of the United Brethren.

8. Drury, op. cit., p. 59.

Martin Boehm (November 30, 1725-March 26, 1812) was born of Mennonite stock seven miles south of Lancaster, Pennsylvania. He had been elected a Mennonite minister by lot without his own consent. About 1758 he was plowing a field when suddenly he experienced a witness of the Spirit in what he called a conversion. His home became a center for evangelistic effort and for this work he was expelled from the Mennonite church about 1775. Boehm and Otterbein were elected to the office of "eldesten" (superintendent or bishop) in the United Brethren church in 1800. They continued with much zeal to preach to the Pennsylvania Germans, at first with little thought for organization, but after 1800 with the objective of winning these people for Christ and into the church of the United Brethren in Christ.

Jacob Albright (May 1, 1759-May 18, 1808) was born near Pottstown, Pennsylvania, of German immigrant parentage and settled near Hinkletown, Pennsylvania, establishing a profitable tile business in his early manhood. The Albrights lost six of their nine children and Jacob felt that he was being punished for his sins. Under the preaching of Rev. Anton Hautz at the funerals of his children Albright was convicted of sin. Later at the home of Adam Riegel, a local preacher in the United Brethren church, Albright was converted after spending many hours in prayer. Of his own conversion he writes:

"By and by all anxiety and anguish of soul disappeared; happiness and a joyous peace in God filled my soul, God's Spirit bearing witness with my spirit that I had become a child of God; one happy sensation fol-

lowed another, and such a heavenly joy pervaded my whole being, as no pen can describe, and no mortal can express — compared with which all fullness of sensual pleasures, that I had ever enjoyed, were nothing but wretchedness and illusion."[9]

Albright had been reared in the Lutheran church but was expelled from it after his conversion when he began to preach to his fellow Germans about his religious experience. He joined a Methodist class near his home for a time but in 1800 organized his converts into classes and thus formed the nucleus for the Evangelical church. His body was called "The Newly Formed Methodist Conference" until 1807 when Albright was elected bishop and instructed to draft a "book of discipline or handbook for the group."

Common Type of Organization

Out of a common experience of these leaders there developed two churches with similar motive and organization throughout these years. Even the doctrines and polities of these groups are very similar. It appears that in most matters relating to doctrine, polity and organization these bodies resemble the Methodist church very closely. The United Brethren doctrines are usually more briefly stated and are confined to thirteen articles. The Evangelical church has nineteen articles and a long paragraph on "regeneration, sanctification and Christian perfection" which was taken from the Methodist Book of Discipline. It is the opinion of members of the Evangelical church and the church of the United Brethren in Christ, who have carefully examined both

9. Quoted in Orwig, op. cit., pp. 11 and 12.

systems of doctrine, that there are absolutely no discrepancies in actual content.

In polity and organization there are a few slight differences between these denominations but none so large or serious that could not easily be adjusted with satisfaction to both bodies. The United Brethren have but one order of the ministry, viz., "elders," while the Evangelical church recognizes both "deacons" and "elders." District superintendents are elected annually in the United Brethren church and quadrennially in the Evangelical church. Delegates to the general conferences of the United Brethren church are chosen by the local congregations while in the Evangelical church these elections are made by the annual conferences from the nominees made by the congregations, or a group of congregations constituting a charge. There is also an obsolete provision among the United Brethren that local ministers (*i.e.*, lay-preachers) have equal rights and privileges with the itinerant ministers in the annual conference.

Both denominations have a board of bishops and in each case there are five active and two emeritus. In the other general boards there is almost identical organization although the name of the boards may vary slightly. In addition to those of the Evangelical church the United Brethren have a board of church trustees for the care of general church property and an advisory board of administration for outlining the program of the denomination.

The Status of These Churches

The United Brethren church has one theological seminary at Dayton, Ohio, while the Evangelical church has

three—one at Naperville, Illinois; one at Reading, Pennsylvania; and one at Reutlingen, Germany. The United Brethren have one college in Pennsylvania, three others in the east, and two west of the Mississippi. The Evangelical church has three colleges — one in the east, one in the north central section, and another in the west. The Evangelical church has two publishing houses — at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and Cleveland, Ohio, while the publishing interests of the United Brethren are centered in Dayton, Ohio. The United Brethren have two homes and orphanages in the east and one in the far west. The Evangelicals have three homes and orphanages in the east, two in the central area, and one in the far west. There are also eight Evangelical hospitals scattered largely throughout the north central states.

Regions	United Brethren		Evangelicals		Both Bodies (If United)	
	Churches	*Members*	*Churches*	*Members*	*Churches*	*Members*
Pennsylvania and Ohio	1,050	181,897	723	85,976	1,773	267,873
Others East of Miss.	1,273	155,759	746	81,382	2,019	237,141
West of Mississippi	529	56,469	662	53,673	1,191	110,142
Europe	-----	-----	433	33,601	433	33,601
Japan	20	2,033	?	2,010	20+	4,043
China	7	1,018	?	1,307	7+	2,325
Kentucky Mission	-----	-----	3	283	3	283
West Africa	34	2,163	(A new mission)		34	2,163
Porto Rico	21	1,715	----	-------	21	1,715
Philippines	45	5,488	----	-------	45	5,488
	2,979	406,542	2,567	258,232	5,546	664,774

Relations of the United Brethren and Evangelical Churches

In the year 1813, the same in which the United Brethren church received overtures from the Baltimore conference of the Methodist church, a committee con-

sisting of Bishop C. Newcomer, Christian Crum, Joseph Hoffman, and J. Baulus was appointed to confer with a similar committee from the Evangelical church. While the negotiations with the Methodists were for the purpose of "friendly coöperation," the avowed purpose of the negotiations with the Evangelicals was "organic union."[10] The Evangelical committee was comprised of George Miller, John Walter, John Dreisbach, and Henry Niebel. These committees met in council on November 11, 1813, but after several days departed without evident success in their mission.

During the next few years, however, friendly communications continued. A second attempt to unite these bodies failed on February 14, 1817, because the committees were unauthorized to proceed to actual union. John Dreisbach, an Evangelical, writes of this meeting: "Yet we prayed with and for each other, preached and exhorted alternately, bade each other Godspeed in our operations and pledged ourselves to treat one another as Christians and children of God."[11] Renewed efforts were made to unite these two organizations about 1855 but only an increased feeling of friendship resulted.[12]

Since these churches from the beginning have had a common heritage, a similar purpose, an almost identical type of organization and always a friendly relation with each other it is only natural that one might assume that this friendly relation will continue and even develop into the basis of an organic union of these

10. Berger, Daniel—*History of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ*, Otterbein Press, Dayton, Ohio, 1904, p. 182 f.
11. Orwig, op. cit., p. 90.
12. Drury, op. cit., p. 548.

churches. It would be a fitting way to perpetuate the noble spirit of the founders of both these bodies if these denominations could be made one so that the organization would be co-extensive with the unity of spirit and purpose that has prevailed from the beginning among the "Evangelical Brethren."[13]

13. A suggestion for the name of the new church which would preserve the particular genius of each body and fairly perpetuate the spirit of the founders of each.

RAYMOND W. ALBRIGHT.

THE WOUNDED CHRIST-HEART

Anew he is wounded! The barbs of his wounding
Are hurled by his children, those marked with his name,
Who carry his banners, who ring forth hosannas—
These robe him with shame.

Anew he is wounded. The Temple he builded,
The fabric he reared from the stream of his blood,
Is shivered with echoes that score him, that shame him—
Who built with his blood.

The Soul-of-the-world is aghast at its moorings—
The rock of its faith that standeth secure
It is racked by the breakers of sound that beat over;
Keen voices that follow time's lure.

Oh, the voices! These voices, all barbed that bruise him;
His own children's voices, once pledged and apart,
That shame him—the Christ of the world—soul immortal—
They wound the Christ-heart.

—George Klingle.

WHAT IS OUR STANDARD?

By Rev. Daniel Sommer
Editor of *The Apostolic Review*, Indianapolis, Indiana

IN all domains of life, and in all departments of business a standard of measuring is necessary. The correctness of the standard adopted will determine in a degree what the result will be. Making allowance for individual imperfections is necessary, yet the standard of measuring that has been adopted must not be forgotten if uniform results would be accomplished. All of this needs only to be stated in order to be understood and admitted. And what is true in all other departments is certainly true in regard to religion. And the theme of this article is intended to be — the right standard in regard to religion.

What is commonly designated the Christian religion has been declared by its advocates to have the perfect exemplar in the person of Jesus the Christ. His record, as offered in the first four books of the New Testament, indicates that he is the preëminent one. Pontius Pilate's declaration — "I find no fault in him" — this has been the universal sentence of all who have read with care the records which reveal his life, words, works, death, and the burial of his body. And the same may be said of Saul of Tarsus with some degree of truth — after his conversion. Jesus the Christ was the perfect exemplar, and Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, was the perfect imitator of that exemplar, and was chosen to be a "pattern" for us. (1 Timothy 1:16.)

If professed Christians ignore Christ as their exemplar and Paul as their pattern, then they are certainly like a boat at sea without rudder, chart, or compass. Or they may be likened to the descendants of Noah who met in the plain of Shinar and proposed to build a tower there whose top would reach to heaven, and which would be for them as a bond of union and would make for them a name. Or they may be likened to later descendants of Noah who did not "like to retain God in their knowledge" and who were given over by the creator to "a reprobate mind." Or they may be likened unto Moses when he was angry and said, "Must we fetch you water out of this rock?" In other words, those professed Christians who forget Christ as their perfect exemplar and Paul as their pattern feel at liberty in their onward course to erect, or formulate, standards of their own. That is to say, all those who do not feel bound up and down, and under to that which is divinely authorized are liable to think they may arrange some plan of their own for their guidance.

Suppose for illustration that several men are standing together looking at a pile of boards and they begin to guess how many feet of lumber are in that pile. They all differ from each other, and their guesses vary from one to two thousand feet. But soon a carpenter joins that company, and when he is inquired of concerning the number of feet of lumber in the pile of boards before him he does not guess, but reaches for his two-foot rule and measures the lumber. Then when he states the exact number of feet of lumber in that pile of boards the guessing ends, and the controversy is settled. All who are capable of the most ordinary

thought can understand such an illustration and its application to religion. If we have no standard by which to measure, that all who are concerned will accept as correct, then we are like the men we have supposed to be guessing about the number of feet of lumber in a pile of boards before the carpenter came.

Now we are prepared to consider that if Jesus the Christ and Paul the apostle to the Gentiles be not accepted as standards by which to measure, or ideals to which we must conform to the utmost of our powers, then all of our talk about unity or union or conformity is in vain. We may talk and write as much as we please about morality, and ethics, and churchly practices, and what is unbrotherly and unchristian and contrary to the mind of Christ. But if we do not let Christ speak for himself, then we are liable to be like men guessing about a pile of lumber. Therefore, we should cease our talk about ethics and let Christ speak for himself, and here are offered several extracts from his speeches as recorded in the apostle John's record of him.

"The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do . . . I can of mine own self do nothing." (John 5:19, 30.) "When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me. I speak these things." (John 8:28.) Here we are informed that our Savior regarded himself as bound by the divine Father's words. When we think of the example of Christ we should remember this, and when we think of the Spirit of Christ we should not forget this. He could do nothing of himself while in the flesh. But all creed makers did not regard them-

selves as bound to the will of Christ as he regarded himself as bound to the will of his Father. He could do nothing of himself, but all creed makers, and all other division workers, feel at liberty to do many things of themselves. He was bound, but they are not. The Savior was limited while here on earth in person, but they are not limited. Yet they talk about "the Spirit of Christ," and are not afraid to repeat the declaration, "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his." Moses when angry said, "Must we fetch you water out of this rock?" And on the principle of that speech, also the speech of the builders of the tower of Babel, all creed makers have acted. Nor are those free from that spirit who have apologized for those creeds. Neither are those free from the spirit of Moses, when he was angry, who now erect or arrange or formulate speculative standards by which to decide who are Christians, and what is "the Spirit of Christ" by which they should be guided, nor the law of ethics which should be observed to show the Spirit of Christ. And what may we say of those who are trying to erect or build a platform broad or narrow enough for all professed Christians to stand on or adopt? They show that they have not duly considered the teaching of Christ in his allegiance to his Father, and that we should have the same allegiance to him which he showed for his Father when he said he could do nothing of himself.

But in order to shorten this controversy or reasoning about standard of measuring we should ask the question whether any of us would be willing to die for any name, doctrine, practice, theory, office, whereby professed Christians are divided. Then we should ask

whether we are justified in being divided over anything for which we would not be willing to die if religious persecution should be introduced again. Suppose that the Bolshevists could gain the ascendancy in every country, and suppose they would order every religious book burned except the Bible, under penalty of death by fire. How many would decide to suffer martyrdom for books of human origin? Not one — I think we may safely say. Then suppose that all persons that have a copy of the Bible, or even of the New Testament, would be required to burn it under penalty of death by fire, or death any other way, then what? I believe we would have many martyrs.

On the same principle of reasoning by asking questions we may inquire, what would we think if all the secret orders would send representative men to some place in order to discuss the question of coming together without giving up any of their secrets but simply discuss ethics; or how well they should treat each other while maintaining their different arbitrary secrets? Then suppose representative men of all nations would come together and discuss the question of ethics, or how well they should treat each other while maintaining their national peculiarities? Such questions indicate what has thus far been accomplished in the religious union or unity conferences thus far held.

If the new covenant Scriptures are not of supreme authority with us all, then let us discard the name Christian altogether. And if the doctrine of conversion to Christ offered in the book of Acts is not of supreme authority in turning people from darkness to light, and from the power of satan unto God, then we should

decide to go on our way to the end in our separation. Does some one say that the primitive order was all right for the church in its infancy, but when it became a national institution, then a different order needed to be introduced? If so the response should be made that the same reasoning would then apply to the family. God ordained the family as consisting of one man and his wife and their children. Does some one say that the family as ordained of God was departed from in both the Patriarchal and Jewish ages? But when that is admitted then the answer is ready that the history of those departures is, with the rarest exception, a history of troubles. But the new covenant Scriptures reaffirm the original doctrine of one man, one wife, and their children in obedience to them. And on the same principle the church of the New Testament must now contend for the original order of conversion to Christ, then of worship and work and government. And why contend for coming together in communion, without coming together in regard to conversion? If we are all converted to Christ according to the book of Acts by a whole-hearted faith, repentance, confession and baptism, then the question of communion is settled, for then we shall come together at the Lord's table because we belong together as members of the same great and glorious family.

DANIEL SOMMER.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

Fellowship at the Lord's Table

Dr. H. R. L. Sheppard, formerly of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields and more recently dean of Canterbury, made history recently by taking part in the administration of the communion according to the rite of the Presbyterian church of England, at the invitation of the minister and session of Crouch-hill church. Dr. A. Herbert Gray conducted the first part of the service and observed that it was a very great joy to them that Dr. Sheppard had seen his way to accept their invitation to join in the fellowship of the Lord's table, and they gave him a very cordial welcome that morning. There was no man who lived more in the hearts of English people than did Dr. Sheppard. They were not forgetful that while his visit might give pleasure to themselves, it might mean criticism, difficulty and hostility to their visitor, and they desired to assure him that they would pray for him all needed strength alike in body and in spirit.

Dr. Gray preached from John xvii. 20-21. He said he believed a great yearning for Christian unity was spreading over the world, coupled with a sense of shame in our divisions. It could not be denied that most of the reasons for our divisions had now lost most of their relevance. Some way must be found for getting over denominational barriers. There could be real fellowship with other Christians even though in many matters there might be disagreement. In the one body of Christ there was large room for diversity in minor matters. Without ignoring the hard facts of the present situation, there could surely be real fellowship around

the cross. "The thing which we all have in common is love of Christ. It is as we pray together and worship together that we shall come to this sense of unity, and that unity should be most beautiful and blessed at the Lord's table. That table must not be a divisive thing, but be open to all his friends."

Dr. Gray then took his place at the communion table, with the elders to his right and left. Dr. Sheppard occupied the seat immediately to the right of the minister. Dr. Gray carried through the rite until the bread had been distributed, and then the two ministers changed places and Dr. Sheppard set apart the wine and conducted the rest of the service. Two women elders assisted in the distribution of the elements.

For the evening service, notwithstanding most unpropitious weather, the church was crowded to overflowing; a number could not gain admittance. Dr. Gray conducted the service. On rising to preach, Dr. Sheppard's first words were:

"I cannot help beginning by saying how grateful I am to Dr. Gray, your minister, for the generous way in which he has welcomed me on your behalf and on behalf of his elders, and for permitting me to address you this evening. It is a tremendous congregation — a wonderful congregation — and I only hope that I will not fail in the simple things I want to say.

"So long as I live I shall never forget the spiritual experience and lovely privilege that I was allowed to share with many of you this morning. And is there any one who would dare to say that it was an act that would have been displeasing to Jesus Christ? It was some months ago that Dr. Gray — my teacher as well as my great friend for many years now — and his elders invited me to take part in your communion. I gladly and gratefully accepted, and it was ill-health alone that prevented me from coming here at that time — a time when I was a more considerable and important person than I am this evening. I say that quite deliberately

because I do not want it to be thought that one waited until one was a free lance in the church of England to accept the privilege Dr. Gray and your elders had placed in my way. And I cannot tell you how grateful I am for all that this morning meant to me and will mean to me.

"Why did I take part in your lovely and simple service this morning? I came, first, because you invited me to come, and secondly, because my conscience would not allow me to stay away."

[From *The Christian World*, London.]

Holy Communion and Unity

Undoubtedly there are diverse views in the Protestant Episcopal church on this subject. That holders of these diverse views are equally sincere may not be questioned. Even when the bishops at Lambeth conference put forth a declaration in favor of one view, this does not imply that it carries unanimous assent of every member of the assembly. It may, and doubtless does affirm consent, for the time being, to a general pronouncement which presumably reflects the dominant mind of the church. Lambeth conference, as is well known, is not a legislative body. Its findings are not prescribed as ecclesiastical enactments. Nevertheless they must have great weight, at least throughout the Anglican communion. Whether it be true of all assemblies met for conference or legislation, it holds true of ecclesiastical assemblies, that they seldom, if ever, initiate, or advance something entirely new. They are registries. In the course of events, problems arise, in the realm of thought and speculation, or in the sphere of conduct and practice. Assemblies for free and open discussion consider these problems which are presented to them. They have already arisen. A consensus of opinion is reached either by majority vote or compro-

mise. Thus an opinion, already prevailing, is registered.

In the early missionary work of the church it was not foreseen that inevitably there would arise discussion over Mosaic ordinances when the Gospel should be preached to the Gentiles. The apostles did not prescribe or pronounce judgment beforehand. But the problem arose, because Paul and Barnabas had met the situation in accord with their own convictions of "the liberty wherewith Christ had set them free." Thus the apostles and elders met in Jerusalem not to forestall an issue, but "were gathered together to consider of this matter." The result was a compromise to which the Apostle Paul consented for the prudential reasons stated, but which have long since lapsed in desuetude. The freed Christian mind and conscience outgrew the limitations imposed.

So may we not venture to believe that on the subject of holy communion and unity, the Lambeth conference of 1930 did not think of precluding a possible change of thought and feeling in the Anglican communion? Certainly there is no one in this communion, of any school of churchmanship, who would desire to offer the formula Lambeth *locuta est, finita est,* as an article of faith. What did Lambeth say? "The general rule of our church must therefore be held to exclude indiscriminate intercommunion, or any such intercommunion as expresses acquiescence in the continuance of separately organized churches." Then with reference to earlier discussion, the report continues, "From what has been already said it will be evident why we hold as a general principle that intercommunion should be the goal of, rather than a means to, the restoration of union." The diverse views on holy communion and unity referred to at the beginning of this article are here set forth in the Lambeth utterance. May intercommunion serve as a means of drawing divided Christians into the cherished fellowship of unity, or should it be deferred until all differences are composed and terms of union agreed upon? Lambeth has registered what probably is the

majority opinion, at least of the clerical order, in our church to-day. That so far as this church of ours is concerned, intercommunion shall be deferred until terms of unity are agreed upon. Representatives of Christian churches may come together, seek the guidance of the Holy Spirit in discussion and deliberation in earnest desire to learn how they may make manifest the oneness of their witness for Christ, but they may not, with approval assemble together at the Lord's appointed table and partake together of the bread of life. Will this registered opinion of Lambeth change? Not a few devoutly hope it will, and that a later conference will witness a reversal.

The Lambeth conference, unlike the first council of Jerusalem, is not composed of apostles and elders. But elders are included among the faithful to whom the bishops address their letter, hoping that it will "lead many to study" their findings. And it is heartening to an "elder" to find a member of the upper order speaking with his tongue or pen, the very musings that were causing the fire to kindle in his own heart. He is the bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich writing in his diocesan magazine. These are his words, "I do not think we shall arrive at a real unity in organization till we have trained ourselves to kneel together at the same board and receive together and at one another's hands the tokens of divine love in the sacrament of unity. It must often appear strange that it is that very sacrament of unity and of brotherly love that is the badge of our differences. For myself I cannot think that his sacrament 'Drink ye all of this,' ought to be regarded as the *final seal* of unity won (a unity, too, which is only just that of organization, and certainly not of like-mindedness or of similar interpretations, since Anglo-catholic and Evangelical and Modernist can partake together), but a vital means of bringing about a unity of spirit—we, who are many, one body, because all partakers of the one bread" (italic ours).

Opinions in recorded documents do not change. Living personalities move on, carry multitudes with them and old positions are left behind. Silence is golden. Yes, at times. Not infrequently silence is leaden. With the implied assent of unbroken silence, "intercommunion a goal, not a means" might soon be exalted to the authority of an unchallengeable ecclesiastical axiom. But if the gracious words of the bishop quoted are reechoed by all who share his spirit, in another decade Lambeth may be called upon to reflect and register a changed view in the Anglican communion.

[From Rev. Romilly F. Humphries, Baltimore, in *The Churchman*, New York.]

North India Round Table Conference on Union

For three days there met in round table conference at Delhi, on the subject of church union in North India, representatives, among others, of the North India United church, the Methodist Episcopal church, the church of India, Burma and Ceylon and the Disciples mission, and the society of Friends. Two members of the South India joint committee on union were present by invitation, Dr. J. J. Banninga, representing the South India United church delegation to the joint committee. Of the representatives of the church of India, Burma and Ceylon, two had been present at the meeting of the South India joint committee held in Madras, Canon Fisher and Rev. W. E. S. Holland.

Upon Dr. Banninga fell the main burden of the explanation to the conference of the proposed scheme of union for South India, as amended at the recent Madras session of the joint committee. Nothing could have been more helpful than Dr. Banninga's advocacy of union and his exposition of the proposed scheme. Perfectly clear, absolutely fair, and not seldom impassioned, his addresses made a great impression on the conference. One distinctly critical member of the con-

ference said in private that he found himself "warming to the scheme," as he realized the spirit in which it had been conceived.

If at certain important points there was little fervor for the scheme shown in the sessions of the conference, it seemed to us, the South Indian visitors, that as the conference proceeded there was a definite increase of understanding of it, and the final form of the resolutions passed by the conference contained little that is not either definitely expressed or implicit in the South India scheme. We prefer our South India paragraph on doctrinal standards in section III, the Basis of Union, para. (A), Faith and Order; but there is nothing in the North India resolutions on the subject which we could not accept heartily. So of the resolutions on the sacraments, in which, it may be noted, the presence of members of both the English Baptist church and the society of Friends led to the inclusion of the following paragraphs:—

(2) The difficulty of union between those who practice baptism by immersion on confession of faith, and those who use infant baptism and permit sprinkling and pouring, may, perhaps, be best overcome by applying the principle of congregational autonomy.

(4) We welcome the personal statement made by members of the society of Friends as to the possibility of their union with those who outwardly observe the sacraments of baptism and the supper of the Lord, and desire to consider this matter in all its implications with a view to a more definite statement.

These paragraphs are most significant and are the ground of hope which some of us may confess with shame we had hardly dared at present to entertain.

[From Rev. W. E. Tomlinson in *The Church Union News and Views,* Madras, India.]

Third Biennial Pennsylvania Conference

Four years ago, shortly before the Lausanne conference, the first biennial state conference was held in

Pennsylvania. It was an impressive gathering and marked the beginning of the series of such conferences of which the third has recently been held in Grace Methodist Episcopal church, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. During these four years it has been interesting and encouraging to see the progress which has been made in the movement toward church unity.

During this time the number of denominations cooperating has steadily increased and there has been a still greater growth in the closer coördination of the work of the churches, their better understanding of one another and the development of the spirit of church unity.

The last conference was attended by representatives of twenty denominations and three others had expected to have delegates but these were unavoidably detained at the last moment.

The representatives, official and unofficial, were appointed on the basis of one minister and one layman or laywoman for every ten thousand communicant members or major fraction thereof. The number was thus purposely kept small so that the entire group would not be too large for frank and friendly discussion and it was very definitely understood that no action taken would be binding.

The denominations participating included these: African Methodist Episcopal, African Methodist Episcopal Zion, Baptist, church of Brethren, churches of God, Congregational, Disciples of Christ, Evangelical, Evangelical Congregational, Friends, Methodist Episcopal, Methodist Protestant, Moravian, Presbyterian, Protestant Episcopal, Reformed church in U. S., Reformed Episcopal, United Brethren, United Lutheran, and United Presbyterian.

Besides these, representatives had been expected from the Brethren in Christ, Missionary Baptist and United Brethren, Old Constitution.

The Continuation Committee in charge of the con-

ference was composed of Rev. Robert Bagnell, D.D., chairman; Rev. S. W. Herman, D.D.; President George W. Richards, D.D.; Rev. Floyd W. Tomkins, Jr.; Rev. Leon K. Willman, D.D.; Rev. W. I. Wisehart, D.D., and Rev. William L. Mudge, ex-officio, as executive secretary of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches. This committee has been reappointed to arrange for another conference in the spring of 1933.

Above all we should emphasize the spirit of prayer which prevailed. It was seen and felt not only during the devotional periods but in special sessions of prayer and there is no doubt in the minds of those who attended the conference that without this deep prayerfulness such a conference would not have brought such evident blessings which will be carried to every part of Pennsylvania and other states as well.

The conclusions drawn from all the discussions left no doubt as to the spirit of unity now prevailing and to the desirability of cultivating it to the limit. It was for this that Christ prayed, and it is the answer to that prayer the world expects.

We find, however, that in spite of the reality of the spirit of unity, there remain certain difficulties of faith and practice, particularly in regard to creeds, ordination, and sacraments, which to certain groups appear to be adequate reason for holding back from organic church union. We urge a continued and prayerful study of these differences, looking toward a better understanding and a closer unity.

But such reasons for remaining apart are not relevant to all Christian bodies. Those bodies which do not feel these difficulties, and do now have common ground in faith and practice, we strongly urge to press on to organic union.

One obvious expression of the unity already existing is more general and wholehearted participation in the unifying organizations now functioning, such as the Federal Council of Churches, the state and city

councils or federations of churches, the Foreign Missions Conference, the Home Missions Council, the International Council of Religious Education and many others.

It was suggested:

(1) That a state-wide exchange of pulpits by evangelical ministers be arranged for some specified Sunday, it being provided that this be not expected to apply to ministers of churches whose polity would forbid.

(2) That in every community, the local council or federation of churches or ministerial association be encouraged to hold, at least annually, a union communion service for all Christian believers disposed to partake.

(3) That union three hour services on Good Friday be likewise encouraged.

[From Rev. W. L. Mudge, D.D., Executive Secretary of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches, Harrisburg, Pa.]

Friendship Between Jews, Catholics, and Protestants

"There can be, of course, no compromise in the realm of fundamental belief. But respect and generous feeling there may be. In your fellowship you are doing something toward the realization of the ideals of real religion." Archbishop Hanna, speaking as a Roman Catholic to a group of notable Jews, Roman Catholics, and Protestants, clerical and lay, at the Athens club, Oakland recently, gave utterance to a religious temper that has not, unfortunately, always graced either Roman Catholics, Protestants, or Jews. It is not least among the good signs in our time that such a group as the East Bay Religious Fellowship can assemble, can form itself into permanent being, can meet once a month about tables, and also hear some distinguished spokesmen of the faiths represented.

The fellowship still is only a few months old and its work lies mostly ahead, but the promise rests in this that its personnel is composed of carefully selected men from all the religious life of the East Bay. Rabbi Rudolph I. Coffee presides, Mr. Harry L. Kingman (of the Congregational church), whose work in animating interest in the fellowship has been most valuable, is secretary. A couple of months ago a well known rabbi from the east addressed us. The month before that it was Bishop Parsons, a Protestant. Last month it was Archbishop Hanna, a Roman Catholic.

None of these men have been careless of their own faith, and yet they have all reflected the more generous catholicity of our time. "No compromise in the realm of fundamental belief." Each of us is the more sure of what that is the less we reflect. "Fundamental belief" is a thing that a man should be prepared to die for. But there are many points of view, important to us and not lightly to be discarded, that can scarcely be ranked with "fundamental belief."

It by no means follows that each point of view is just as correct as the other and that therefore all resistance to other opinions should cease. This would mean the termination in all progress in clarity. In any of the sciences the disaster of such an attitude would be apparent. Some religious theories are closer to the truth than others, they articulate it better, release it more adequately into the life of man.

Nevertheless here is a distinction between theories of evolution and a "fundamental belief" in evolution. When the archbishop immediately adds that "respect and generous feelings there may be," and when every heart amongst us answers immediately to such a statement, I wonder if we are not all tacitly acknowledging that our "fundamental beliefs" are pretty close together. "The Jew has the highest concept of the nature of God, and of the relation of man to God. He has the highest code of morality," said Archbishop Hanna: and has not the Protestant, and the Roman Catholic?

In the past the Roman Catholic and Protestant have written between them some bitter and sorrowful pages of mutual antagonism, and yet when we are left alone we draw closer together, we worship side by side, we share the same communion, the same hope, the same Christ. Politics and ecclesiasticism have worked mightily, and banefully, among us, yet they are not of the "fundamentals." In all dearest Christian sentiment, in all deathless devotions and heroisms in the cause of God and of his Christ, in every most sacred spiritual experience, in sharing of divine companionship here and of hope of heaven beyond, Roman Catholic and Protestant can stand face to face with hands on each other's shoulders, saying gently, "My brother!"

And the Jew. Into his sacred Scriptures run the roots of Roman Catholic and Protestant alike. Not even in the New Testament are words more rich with the love of God than some of the immortal sentences of the Old Testament. "The Jew has not Christ." But has he not? The Christian believes that Jesus Christ is the greatest asset religion has, clarifying and fulfilling and bringing to flower the great religious processes of the ancient Hebrew. Let us not contend for names and modes. In point of fact has the Jew indeed shut Christ out? Could so serious a soul as the Jew be capable of such a thing? He may have resisted the name of Christ, but has he resisted the spirit? It is the spirit that giveth life. On any reading, light broke forth in Jesus Christ. If the house of Israel have windows, can it shut out light? Christians who have drawn so much from Israel have also given. All of us interact, mellowing, informing, restraining, inspiring. We do well to treat each other with "respect and generous feeling" for the soul of mankind is a magnet that draws to itself truth from many quarters, and we recognize in each other beauty that we ourselves have known and loved long since.

Before Archbishop Hanna spoke a resolution was unanimously adopted admitting to membership in the

fellowship representatives of the Negro, Chinese, Japanese, and any other non-Caucasian races in the East bay, and a committee was appointed to select and recommend such representatives. From the timely resolution, signed by Rabbi Max J. Merritt, President Herman F. Swartz, and Mr. Allan C. Blaisdell, I quote the following: "We feel that in a generation that still submits supinely to color and racial prejudice, it is the duty of such groups as ours to set our communities an example, to lead the way to fairer goals and to give earnest of our determination to do what in us lies to make an end of foolish and injurious prejudices of race and color."

One's first impulse is to exclaim, "Excellent!" One's next, if he reflects at all, is to confess to something like dismay. Here is the most select religious group in the East bay, even so fine a group as that, finding it necessary to pass such a resolution! Of course I think we did well to declare: There shall be no barriers! but how came it that we ever assumed there could be? I suspect that each faith present, none of them young in the world, made a fearfully self-indicting acknowledgment in thus having to recognize that there could be barriers. Outside the pale of religion, in the godless "world," racial discriminations may be only infantile; in the presence of the universal Father of Jew and Christian, they become an apostasy!

[From Rev. O. W. S. McCall, Minister, First Congregational church, Berkeley, California.]

Are Catholic and Evangelical Views on the Ministry Reconcilable?

The South Indian church union scheme was expounded recently in a fellowship at which a theological professor, who is one of the clearest thinkers in Methodism, was present. After the exposition he stated that

while there was much in the scheme itself, and still more in the fact that such a scheme had been framed at all, that commanded his heartiest sympathy, yet there were certain fundamental difficulties concerning which he could not make up his mind. His impulse was, whenever he heard the word "union" to put up his hand in favor of it. So far indeed, it seemed to him, that every gulf that separated church from church could ultimately be bridged—except the very one that the South Indian scheme seeks to bridge. The scheme involves the acceptance of the historic episcopate, on the distinct understanding that this acceptance does not carry with it any particular theory as to the nature of Episcopacy. Yet there will be in the united church two distinct sections, one holding the Protestant and Evangelical theory as to the nature of the church and ministry and sacraments, and the other the Catholic and sacerdotal theory. Is a real union possible under these conditions, or does the cleavage go so deep as to involve irreconcilable principles? The division in this case is not merely one that has been imposed upon the Indian churches by the missionaries from the west. It goes back to primitive Christianity. Paul had to wage a great fight for freedom against the legalistic tyranny which the Judaizing element would have imposed upon the young Gentile churches. The cleavage indeed goes further back still, for it lies behind the great assertion of the prophets that no particular outward ritual is essential in religion. Is it really possible to combine these two opposing points of view in one church so as to have spiritual unity as well as corporate union? The illustration of comprehension as it is found in the church of England is hardly a happy one as evidenced by the present condition of that church, and the attitude of the "Catholic" and "Protestant" sections one to the other in connection with the new Prayer Book. The speaker said that he had never heard any advocate of the South India scheme really face up to the problem as to whether the

Catholic and Evangelical views of the ministry and sacraments are not really irreconcilable and therefore any real union in one church of representatives of the two schools of thought, absolutely impossible. That this is the case the extreme Anglo-catholic and the extreme Free churchman would agree in asserting. Are they right and have those who have framed the scheme evaded fundamental disagreement which must ultimately wreck the proposed union?

Now it must be granted that corporate union between the extreme Anglo-catholic and any non-episcopal church on the one hand, or say extreme Congregationalists and an Episcopal church on the other are alike unthinkable, for the extremes meet in common impasse. On the one side you have the sacerdotalist insisting that "without the use of particular material medium there is no guarantee of spiritual experience in the church,"[1] the material media in this case being the imposition of hands by a bishop who is in the apostolic succession, which imposition conveys, and is not merely the symbol of, spiritual grace. Those who hold this position rigidly and whole-heartedly, as do the signatories to the Anglo-catholic manifesto of September, 1929, cannot conscientiously consent to unite with a non-episcopal church except on the condition of the reordination of the ministers of that church. Those ministers, however, cannot be false to what they believe is the plain teaching of the New testament, and still less to the reality of their own spiritual experience and consciousness of a divine call to the ministry; which indeed are not their personal experience alone but which are common to the history of the non-episcopal churches everywhere. To accept reördination would be to deny the call of God, and the work of his Spirit in their own ministry and in the life of the churches to which they belong. But the impossibility of union in this case arises from the refusal of the Anglo-catholics to admit, what

1. Ryder Smith, *The Sacramental Society*, p. 45.

the church of England representatives on the joint conference at Lambeth did admit, namely, "that ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's word and administer the sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's word and sacraments in the universal church."[2]

On the other hand the extreme Congregationalist says in effect: "We will not have Episcopacy, with or without apostolic succession, at any price." The essential condition on which union with the Anglican church is to be allowed is the abandonment of a practice that "prevailed universally from the second to the sixteenth centuries and in three-quarters of Christendom to-day,"[3] and which has been the foundation of church government in the church of England through all the centuries of its history. This is to ask even the Evangelical churchman to disown his past, and to be disloyal to his present religious experience which are as real and precious to him as are the history and experience of the churches to us. Union along these lines is no less impossible than acceptance of the demands of the Catholics, Anglo or Roman.

The attitude of mind which demands it is in effect as intransigent and impossible as that of the Roman church itself in its insistence upon submission to the papacy, and the average Anglican is as little able to accept the one ultimatum as the other. The Indian ministers at Tranquebar were surely on the right lines when they insisted that the united church in India must conserve the three elements of Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and Congregationalism, and that real union must be achieved not on the principle of compromise for the sake of peace but of comprehension for the sake of truth. Enduring union cannot be based on wiping out the ecclesiastical identity of any of the contracting

2. *The Church of England and the Free Churches*, p. 46.
3. B. P. Palmer, *Review of the Church*, Jan. 1930, p. 38.

parties, or achieved by the creation of a new type of church life and government utterly unlike anything that has gone before.

Real union therefore on an exclusive basis, whether from the Anglican or Free church side is utterly impossible. That real union is possible on an inclusive basis in which whatever is worth while in the treasury of each church shall be made available for the upbuilding of the whole is the firm belief of those who have helped to frame the scheme. The rationale of such a faith must be in something more vital than expediency, something deeper and more fundamental than all our divisions and differences. That which unites must be deeper than that which divides; the chasm must be bridged from below (if an Irishism may be allowed) and not from above. To change the figure, there is only one foundation deep enough and broad enough to bear the weight of such a structure of union as the scheme desires to erect, and that is the realization of the spiritual unity of all the churches concerned; the fact that they are already members of the one church which is his Body. To put it very plainly, if we are already one in Christ and love him well enough, cannot we under the inspiration of his Spirit love one another well enough to unite in a visible church, even though we hold different views as to the meaning of apostolic succession? If not, then there is something bigger in that which divides us than in the spiritual facts and forces that unite us. The crucial question is, which is the more important, our common love and loyalty to Christ, nay more, the certainty of our oneness in him and our sure faith in the guidance of the Spirit in the future development of the united church; or our peculiar views as to sacramental grace, and episcopal ordination and apostolic succession?

The impossibility of enduring organic union can only arise on the one side from a virtual denial of the great spiritual fact that underlies even our most patent divisions; and on the other from a failure to realize to

the full, the implications of the fact of the existing spiritual unity of all true believers in Jesus Christ. The church which is his Body is by its very nature ONE, or it could not be his Body, no matter how deeply and tragically divided the Christian church may be. On the Free church side there is no disposition to question this fact, it is one of the commonplaces of our ecclesiastical belief, and is indeed admitted by a considerable section of the Anglican church, though denied by militant Anglo-catholics. But in India there is a real recognition of this fact even on the Catholic side, and curiously enough a clearer understanding of the implications of the fact than there is amongst certain sections, on the Free church side whether there or here. The essential thing is that though at present outwardly divided, we are all members of the one Body of Christ. What doth hinder then our expressing that realized vital unity in outward corporate union? This is what really lies behind the scheme, and it has been the growing realization of our oneness in Christ that has made its preparation possible. To quote from a sermon preached by Bishop Tubbs of Tinnevelly, at Bangalore recently, when the joint committee was working on the scheme:

"We are not seeking the absorption of one church by another. We Anglicans, for example, are not seeking to make the S.I.U.C. and the Wesleyans join our church. God forbid that we should try to. We have too many faults and failures of our own to try and impose our church upon others. Nor are we seeking to make a new church. What we are trying to do is to show visibly to the world that we are already—'one in Christ.' In spite of our sins and weaknesses, in spite of our pride and stubbornness, our Lord has been working in each part of his divided body and he is now drawing us together so that we may share the good things which he has taught us in our separation. Reunion will mean that we shall pool our spiritual resources."

The acknowledgment of "all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized into the name of the holy trinity as sharing with us membership in the universal church of Christ which is his Body," is the most striking evidence of the guidance of the

Spirit in the Lambeth Appeal, and it is emphasized in the bishops' encyclical letter when they say, "The unity which we seek exists. It is in God, who is the perfection of unity, the one Father, the one Lord, the one Spirit who gives life to the one Body. Again the one Body exists. It needs not to be made, nor to be remade, but to become organic and visible. Once more the fellowship of the members of the one Body exists. It is the work of God, not of man. We have only to discover it, and to set free its activities." It is true that the Lambeth conference could not see its way to accept the full implication of its own admissions; they stumbled at the idea of admitting into the united church, the ministers of other communions without episcopal reördination. Now the vital difference between the South Indian proposals and those of Lambeth is just this, that all ministers of the uniting churches are to be accepted as ministers of the word and of the sacraments without reördination. Surely in this recognition of the existing essential spiritual unity of the three churches we may see a repudiation of the sacerdotal opinion that any particular symbol is essential to the being of a church, for according to Dr. Ryder Smith in his *Sacramental Society,* "the admission of the present ministers of the Free churches into the united church without reördination" is a token of repudiation[4] such as he at any rate would accept. Judged by this test the scheme does provide for a real union between Catholic and Protestant just because it is Catholic enough not to be sacerdotal. If both sections are already part of the one Body of Christ and this is recognized on both sides as fundamental, why should they not venture on the experiment of giving expression to that unity in corporate union and living together as one church acknowledging the Lordship of the One Living Head?

[From W. E. Garman in *The Church Union News and Views,* Madras, India.]

4. See also Bishop Waller, *Church Union in South India,* p. 95.

The Church of To-morrow Must Coöperate to Win

If the church of to-morrow is to be the great hope of the world for which a tired, worn humanity is longing and praying, it must have three characteristics:

First, it must be free and not dominated by any clique, caste, or peculiar type of people.

Secondly, it must believe in the kingdom of God upon earth, which means brotherhood, goodwill to all men.

Thirdly, it must be coöperative.

The greater tasks do not lend themselves to the solution of the single church or the one denomination. The advance in the future, the victories of to-morrow, will be won as we all work together. We face to-morrow in a weakened condition with a hundred different sects whose appeal for support in the yesterdays is worse than silly of to-morrow.

We may not hope for that degree of organic unity which would give common boards of strategy and direction all in a quick space of time. But we may hope for genuine coöperation in vital ways, now and here. The late Bishop Henderson of the Methodist Episcopal church, just before his death, said: "There is a future for every church except for the one which will not coöperate. That church is as good as dead."

I believe that church is an outlaw which will make out its year of activities without first of all seeking earnestly a conference with all other churches of that community in the hope of a unified, coöperative advance all along the line.

[From Fred B. Smith in *The Federal Council Bulletin,* New York.]

BOOK REVIEWS

UNITIVE PROTESTANTISM. A Study in our Religious Resources. By John T. McNeill, Professor of the History of European Christianity in the Divinity School, University of Chicago. Cincinnati: The Abingdon Press. Pages 345. Price $3.00.

This book presents a painstaking argument for a position that is commonly overlooked and that is that Protestantism is a unitive factor — not as it is now, but in its essence it is unitive, not moving toward one head with absolute authority, as in the Catholic church, but moving toward a fellowship of believers in Jesus, whose life is a voluntary association. Such a book furnishes interesting reading to those who regard Protestantism as a series of assaults upon the ecclesiastical and social order. "The Protestant, it is supposed, is one who pushes on from nationalism in religion to sectarianism, and from sectarianism to a religious solitude of pure private judgment freed from authority and association." This is the opening sentence in the Introduction, but over against this view Professor McNeill shows that unity was a pronounced original characteristic of Protestantism and that loyalty to this ideal has not been lacking in any period of its history.

The union movement of these times has back of it a continuous Protestant tradition. Political as well as theological interests frequently obscured the plea for a united church, but invariably the leaders reverted to unity, sometimes in passionate appeals, not merely Protestant unity, but unity for the whole church. It is refreshing to have these facts brought to life by such a wealth of scholarship setting before us the proper character of the Protestant Reformation.

Professor McNeill shows that Luther maintained Rome destroyed catholicity, while Protestantism was an attempt to restore it. The Reformers aimed in thought and organization for the recovery and promotion of catholicity freed from papal control and medieval domination. Partly through their own fault and partly through harmful outside interests they failed in the unitive ends they sought. But modern Protestantism, less entangled with the letter that killeth and giving itself more freely to the Spirit that giveth life, is advancing toward catholicity. Perhaps the best outlook in the whole

volume, so abundantly rich in valuable data, is that Professor McNeill sees in Protestant union a fuller emancipation and, in the process toward unification, he contends that it must find its motivation elsewhere than in the demand for massed power and business economy. It is a book of high merit and will be read with profit by all who are interested in a united Christendom.

WHAT CAN STUDENTS BELIEVE? Arranged by Elmore McNeill McKee. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. Price $1.60.

This volume contains ten sermons by men who have been successful in reaching student congregations. To mention the names would be quite sufficient. Robert Russell Wicks of Princeton, Willard L. Sperry of Harvard, James Roland Angell of Yale, Henry Sloane Coffin, and Reinhold Niebuhr of Union Seminary, together with Charles R. Brown and Harry Emerson Fosdick and others. These sermons have to do not so much with doctrine but with life. They appeal to young people on the basis where they are interested. For example, Dean Wicks of Princeton talks about the habit of living on other people. He lays down the thesis that we either live on, or for others, and shows the shame of the one and the glory of the other. It is just this type of address which catches intelligent and thoughtful young men and women.

President Angell writes on the contemporary youth and the world of religion and morals. It is a baccalaureate address, with the wide horizon and inclusiveness which characterize all he says. Dr. Niebuhr has a most unique subject, entitled, "The Common Root of Joy and Pain." He indicates very clearly how both of these universal human experiences have a common source. The joy of Christ and his cry on the cross have the same origin. His conception is that both the joy and pain are parts of each other, inevitably joined together as two stems out of the same trunk. It is Dr. Fosdick's contention that religion rests upon the deepest nature of man. That it is impossible to eradicate it out of the world unless man is wiped out. So long as he is what he is, religion will continue. Man can not live without the best. All his tools and implements, his pleasures and his passions, his ambitions and his greed are superficial. The real man lies beneath and feeds upon the everlasting bread of life.

FINIS S. IDLEMAN.

MOTHERS OF FAMOUS MEN. By Richard Wallace. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. Price $1.00.

This volume is simply, but humanly written about some of the great mothers of time. Possibly one had better say, mothers of some of the great men of time. His subjects include Augustine, John Wesley, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Gypsy Smith, Booker Washington, and others. The chapters are short but graphically written. The author has gotten at the heart of these great spiritual biographies and has tersely told the story of the source of great inspirations. As the men differ widely, so have the mothers differed, but one common bond runs through the volume, namely, that all of these mothers were deeply religious, rightly ambitious, and nobly unselfish.

FINIS S. IDLEMAN.

HINTERLANDS OF THE CHURCH. By Elizabeth R. Hooker, Author of *United Churches*, etc. New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 230 Park Ave. Pages 314. Price $2.50.

The Institute of Social and Religious Research has rendered valuable service in giving to the public the results of its study in its fields of research. There is a comparatively low proportion of church members in rural territory. The test of church effectiveness was applied by the Institute to rural counties, taken collectively, of each of thirty-eight states, which together included nearly ninety-five per cent. of the area of the United States. Only one out of a selected group of eight Protestant regions had as many as one-third of the people in church membership and most of such regions had considerably less than one-third, in some instances fewer than one-fifth of the people belonged to the churches. The care with which these surveys have been made and their results are nothing less than surprising. The nine chapters, followed by fifty pages of appendices, present facts and appeals that should challenge the whole church of America to correct these unhappy conditions. No denominational church can do it. It must be a united church that shall make such conditions impossible. The decline of the rural population, which began about fifty years ago, has made conditions more difficult. But improved roads, improved school conditions, rural free delivery since 1900, telephones, and radios are factors in reducing the number of rural churches. There is no good reason why the remaining Protestant churches should not get together. It is not simply an economic question; it is both a moral and spiritual question.

There is no place for competing churches in these areas. This book gives a challenge to every home missionary board. Its facts are well sustained and the perusal of its pages will awaken alarm to open-minded readers.

SOME VALUES FOR TO-DAY. By Oscar Thomas Olson. New York: The Abingdon Press. Pages 150. Price $1.50.

This is a volume of five lectures which were delivered at DePauw University on the Simpson Foundation, which furnishes annual lectures on the Christian ministry as a life calling. Among other lecturers on this lectureship have been Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, and Dr. Ralph W. Sockman. Bishop W. F. McDowell has written the Introduction. Dr. Olson is one of the outstanding ministers in Baltimore and it was very appropriate to have him lecture to young men who are preparing for the Christian ministry, reflecting the disclosures of his fellows and the discoveries of his contemporaries in his large ministry. The subjects of the lectures are "A Valid World to Live In," "A Reasonable Religion to Believe In," "A Reliable God to Trust In," "A Personal Christ to Confide In," and "A Liberated Life to Glory In." When the late President Eliot raised the question as to whether people any longer think, the answer may be found in these thoughtful lectures in which the lecturer gathers up the best thought of this day in the field of his themes, rethinks it so finely as to make others think on the values of these days, opening reliable possibilities that otherwise might remain closed. There is a religious fervor running through every lecture and the presentation of facts and testimonies that help in finding a reliable philosophy of life. They furnish a vigorous testimony to the things that must endure.

ALTERNATIVES OF WAR. By Florence Guertin Tuttle. New York: Harper and Brothers. Pages 271. Price $3.00.

This book is dedicated to Aristide Briand, apostle of constructive world peace, and on the page opposite the title page is the following sentence from Frank B. Kellogg: "From the broad standpoint of humanity and civilization, all war is an assault upon the stability of human society, and should be suppressed in the common interest." These two items indicate that the author is thinking straight. She has had a wide acquaintance by study in the whole field of

post-war efforts to insure peace and the work of the League of Nations, as well as personal contact with many of the leaders in this field. She discusses the alternatives of war as observed in arbitration, conciliation, and conferences through the machinery of the League of Nations, the Court of International Justice, the new form of arbitration treaty given at Locarno, and the Kellogg-Briand pact as a moral deterrent of war. She shows clearly in three instances how the present machinery functioned successfully — the Corfu crisis, the Greek-Bulgarian border war, and the war between Paraguay and Bolivia. The chapters on disarmament are particularly strong. "Disarmament," she says, "waits upon the problem of security through world organization. Disarmament belongs to the soluble questions of the world community and its new dependencies." The book closes with a call, especially to Americans, to take seriously the Kellogg-Briand pact and to so implement it that it will lift the moral idealism of the world above where it is. It is a book of conviction and force — worthy of a place among the best in this field.

THE JEW AND HIS NEIGHBOUR. A Study of the Causes of Anti-Semitism. By James W. Parkes, M.A. New York: Robert R. Smith, Inc. Pages 202. Price $2.00.

This volume is the outgrowth of the work of the International Student Service on the Jewish question in the European universities. It is primarily a study in the principles of academic unity and co-operation, but such a study must be linked indissolubly with the Jewish race. The author recognizes that this problem has its roots in history and in human nature and he rightly concludes that by patience and good will it can be unravelled by human intelligence and resolved by human action. It will not come rapidly for fatalism, which is characteristic of both sides, is a great obstacle to progress. Such subjects as the Jewish dispersion, the Jewish community before the outbreak of persecution, the religious, economic, political, and racial element in anti-Semitism, and the inner evolution of the Jewish community are dealt with in fair and comprehensive spirit. Mr. Parkes does not regard Palestine as a solution, but anti-Semitism as it is to-day must disappear. Both Jews and their neighbors must help toward its disappearance and both look to the future rather than thinking in terms of restoration of the past. It is most fortunate that a book like this has appeared in these times.

PRINTED IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE
HESS PRINTING COMPANY
BALTIMORE, MD.

The Equality of all Christians Before God

This is a full report of the New York Conference of the Christian Unity League, held at St. George's Protestant Episcopal church, Nov. 13-15, 1929.

This Conference marked the turning of a decisive corner in the advance toward a united church. Every one who is interested at all in Christian unity will want to read this volume. Every page abounds in interest.

Here is a part of the program: "Prayer as a Factor in the Unity of the Church," by Dr. Peter Ainslie, Baltimore. Greetings by Dr. Karl Reiland, rector of St. George's church. "The Need of a United Christendom," by Mr. Robert Fulton Cutting, vestryman of St. George's church. "What a United Church Can Do That a Divided Church Cannot Do," by Dr. W. Beatty Jennings, Philadelphia. "How Much Christian Unity Do We Now Have?" by Dr. Beverley D. Tucker, Jr., Richmond, Va. "Recent Evidences of Growth Toward Christian Unity," by Dr. J. W. Woodside, Ottawa, Canada. "The End of a Cycle in Protestantism," by Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, Chicago. "A Survey of the Day's Thinking," by Dr. Robert Norwood, New York. "Possibilities of Attaining Christian Unity," by President Daniel L. Marsh, Boston. "What Would Be the Attitude of Jesus Toward a Divided Church?" by Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, New York. "Shall We Continue Our Emphases on Orthodoxy and Conformity Rather Than on Purposes and Objectives?" by President George W. Richards, Lancaster, Pa. "Our obligation to the Future to Hasten a United Christendom," by Dr. W. H. P. Fauce, Providence, R. I. "The Call of the Future for a United Church," by Mr. Stanley High, Editor *The Christian Herald*, New York. Discussion follows each of these addresses.

The dramatic moving of the Lord's supper from St. George's church to the chapel of Union Theological Seminary, with Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin as celebrant, assisted by Dr. Karl Reiland, Dr. Robert Norwood, and Dr. Wallace MacMullen, was one of the significant events that indicates we have come to the time when brotherhood has priority over conformity to ecclesiastical practices.

This is one of the great books of the year.

Price $1.00; paper cover 75 cents

Address

THE CHRISTIAN UNITY LEAGUE

230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md.

VOL. XXI No. 2

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

OCTOBER 1931

ONE OF THE EARLIEST CHRISTIAN GEMS

CONTENTS

At the Editor's Desk

The Irenic Spirit and Christian Union — FREDERICK D. KERSHNER

The Reality and Promise of Church Unity . . . — RICHARD K. MORTON

The Living Church; Its Unity . . . . . — J. VERNON BARTLETT

I Do Not Believe in Foreign Missions . . . . . — FRED SMITH

What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity

Faith and Order at High Leigh — Should the Commission on Faith and Order Be Continued? — Another Lausanne Conference — The Anglicans and Free Churchmen — The Anglicans and the Old Catholics — How the Churches Co-operate at State Universities — Education for Human Brotherhood — Christian Unity in China — Congregationalists and Presbyterians Unite — Our Ludicrous Labels — "In Union There Is Strength" — So Testifies Ohio — Reunion Via "Catholicity" — "We Will Not Pray With You" — Reformed Fundamentalists and Unity — The Need of Christian Unity Prophets — Protestants, Catholics, and Jews to Gather at Washington in 1932

Book Reviews

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Inc.

W. H. HOOVER, President

BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

AGENTS:

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York

Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka, and Sendai

$2.00 a year 50 cents a copy

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Savior — are parts of the Church of Christ and the recognition of their Equality before God is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and equally free to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ—growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in His own words,—"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another."

CONTENTS

OCTOBER, 1931

VOL. XXI. No. 2.

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK 99

THE IRENIC SPIRIT AND CHRISTIAN UNION ..... FREDERICK D. KERSHNER 105

THE REALITY AND PROMISE OF CHURCH UNITY ..... RICHARD K. MORTON 111

THE LIVING CHURCH; ITS UNITY ..... J. VERNON BARTLETT 119

I DO NOT BELIEVE IN FOREIGN MISSIONS ..... FRED SMITH 134

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 140

BOOK REVIEWS 189

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

Ten Hills, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in January, April, July, and October, is fifty cents a single copy, or two dollars a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion or individual contributing annually $5.00 or more to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY EXTENSION FUND will be entitled to receive three copies of THE QUARTERLY free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copies to some designated persons or institutions.

Entered as second-class matter October 18th, 1923, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A., under the Act of Congress of March 3rd, 1879.

The Christian Union Quarterly

EDITOR

PETER AINSLIE, D.D., Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, JR., D. D., Rector St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

DR. HAMILCAR ALIVISATOS,
Athens, Greece.

REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAN CHARLES R. BROWN,
New Haven, Conn.

PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
New York, N.Y.

REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.

PROF. DR. J. EUGENE CHOISY,
Geneva, Switzerland.

REV. S. D. CHOWN, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada.

DR. J. A. CRAMER,
Utrecht, Holland.

PROF. DR. ADOLF DEISSMANN,
Berlin, Germany.

REV. A. W. FORTUNE, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky.

DR. W. E. GARRISON,
Chicago, Ill.

PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE,
London, England.

MOST REV. METROPOLITAN GERMANOS,
Thyatira, Asia Minor.

PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER,
Elon College, N. C.

DR. HENRY T. HODGKIN,
Wallingford, Pa.

REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAN W. R. INGE,
London, England.

PROF. RUFUS M. JONES,
Haverford, Pa.

DR. ADOLPH KELLER
Geneva, Switzerland

BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL,
New York, N. Y.

BISHOP WILLIAM F. MCDOWELL,
Washington, D.C.

REV. JOHN HOWARD MELISH
Brooklyn, N. Y.

REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

DR. WILFRED MONOD,
Paris, France.

DR. C. C. MORRISON,
Chicago, Ill.

DR. JOHN R. MOTT,
New York, N.Y.

BISHOP HARALD OSTENFELD,
Copenhagen, Denmark.

BISHOP EDWARD L. PARSONS,
San Francisco, Calif.

PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS,
Lancaster, Pa.

PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE,
Oxford, England.

PASTOR DR. FRIEDRICH SIEGMUND-SCHULTZE,
Berlin, Germany.

DR. ROBERT E. SPEER,
New York, N.Y.

DR. HENRY VAN DYKE,
Princeton, N. J.

REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich.

BISHOP BOYD VINCENT,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK,
York, England.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

OCTOBER, 1931

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK

THE Christian Unity League is proposing seven conferences in the United States. These begin with Cleveland, November 17-19, in the Presbyterian Church of the Covenant, Rev. Philip S. Bird, minister. This is going to be an outstanding conference. The program, the time, and the place are well suited. It will begin with the celebration of the Lord's supper in which all the denominations sharing in the conference will take part, emphasizing their equality before God. This will be in the evening. The next morning will be devoted to the discussion of the report on "The United Church of Canada," being a report prepared by a commission from the United Church of Canada with Dr. S. D. Chown, chairman. In the afternoon there will be a similar discussion on "The United Church of the United States," prepared by a commission from Chicago with Dr. Herbert L. Willett, chairman. Dean Luther A. Weigle will present "The Message," being the expression of a commission from New England.

On the day following there will be two other reports from commissions, the first dealing with "Unity Movements in Politics, Science, and Industry and their Influence on Unity among Christians," with Dr. John H. MacCracken, chairman of the commission from New York and Pennsylvania. The second report is being prepared by Dr. W. Cosby Bell, chairman of a commission from Virginia, Washington, and New

York, dealing with "Christianity and World Religion." The closing address will be by Dr. John R. Mott.

This is a bare outline of the announcement, which is abundant with great possibilities. The commissions are now working on their reports, which are to be printed in pamphlet form, but will not be distributed until the Cleveland Conference.

Following Cleveland will be the St. Louis Conference at St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Dr. Ivan Lee Holt, minister, which will be held the week before Lent in 1932. Bishop J. F. McConnell will be one of the evening speakers. Then in September, conferences will be held in Minneapolis; Seattle, Dr. Marvin S. Sansbury, chairman; San Francisco Bay, Rt. Rev. Edward L. Parsons, chairman; Los Angeles, Dr. Carl S. Patton, chairman; and Albuquerque. The chairmen have not yet been chosen for the first and last cities in this group but will be shortly.

Many of the leading men of the nation have consented to have part in these conferences and others are being approached. The Christian Unity League is a free platform and the conferences will be made up of free men and women. There are no appointed delegates. Membership is conditioned upon signing the pact of reconciliation, which emphasizes that all Christians are equal before God respecting church membership, participation in the Lord's supper, and pulpit courtesies. It is a call to remove those unbrotherly practices and attitudes that cause one body of Christians to discriminate against other bodies of Christians. Christian unity is essential to a truthful testimony of Jesus Christ.

These unbrotherly barriers must be put aside before we can get down to discuss Christian unity. Until then we are up in the air, afraid of each other and not sure in what direction we are going. Ecclesiastical and theological rubbish have separated us. Some cleaning up has got to be done. It is a big task, but brotherhood is essential to the perpetuation of Christianity. There are multitudes of Christians in all denominations who believe these things and, likewise, believe that the time has come for a forward movement. The Christian Unity League furnishes this opportunity and the Cleveland Conference proposes to sound the note of advance.

IN the passing of Archbishop Söderblom we have lost one of the most charming and picturesque figures in Christian unity in the world. It is doubtful if the see of Upsala was ever graced by a more remarkable man. In his great position he was more democratic than his clergy and had the love of the people equal to the king of his country. I met him for the first time at The Hague in 1919, the first conference after the World War, and he made a profound impression in his effort to heal the wounds between the warring nations. His spirit was extraordinary. He moved among Germans and Frenchmen, Italians and Englishmen, Americans and Hungarians with a freedom and cordiality that always changed the atmosphere. He sought for the unity of Christians with a remarkable passion and he went a long way ahead of his denomination in building his bridges of friendship and fellowship—sometimes in the face of severe criticisms. He was the leader in the Life and Work movement and without him perhaps it would never have been. The Stockholm Conference

of 1925 made history and no country was ever more gracious to its guests from all the nations of the world than the country of the archbishop of Upsala. He was the author of many books, but the most valuable book of recent years from his pen was *Christian Worship,* published in English in America. No one can read its pages without the consciousness of his great personality. A few months ago I had a long letter from him bearing that same hopeful outlook and cordial spirit that had characterized all his utterances. As a member of the editorial council of *The Christian Union Quarterly* he was responsive to every new move toward Christian unity and was eager to inquire further regarding its work. I think of him as one sighing for the reality of the brotherhood of Christendom.

IT is a question whether orthodox theology or good manners is more needed as we attempt to approach an understanding of each other. *The Catholic Standard and Times,* Philadelphia, refers to Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick as "the devil's advocate." To say the least, this is an instance of bad manners. Whether the Catholic church must be held responsible for this expression of bad manners or the home out of which the Catholic editor came, is a question. Perhaps both are to some degree responsible. It must not be charged to Jesus. That much is certain. The Catholic editor has a perfect right to dissent from any of Dr. Fosdick's opinions, as Dr. Fosdick has to dissent from the Catholic editor's opinions. But calling the other "the devil's advocate" indicates that he is not sure of his ground or there is a streak in him that he ought to get rid of. Some denomi-

nations are given to abusing others. It appears to them when they put their protest into coarse language the truth for which they are contending is made more emphatic. It is just the opposite. Gentler the language, stronger the truth. We shall never understand the theologies of each other until our approaches are clothed in good manners.

WHETHER Ramsay MacDonald did a wise thing in forming a coalition cabinet with reduction of all incomes or only the reduction of the rich and well to do in these times of the grave crisis in British affairs is a question, but no one can question the greatness of the prime minister in placing the interest of the country above that of his party. In these days of religious uncertainty if the denominational leaders of the world, Catholic and Protestant, would put Jesus Christ above their parties, it would make a new epoch in Christianity's adventure toward understanding and brotherhood. Men are making daring moves in politics. Why cannot we make equally as daring moves in religion? There is not a denomination that, of its own accord, has moved forward. All advances have been largely due to outside influences, influences of Christian groups on the denominational group. Is it not possible for the denominations themselves to move forward on their own initiative? It is only in this way that we shall find the paths of reconciliation.

THE churches in the United States may be divided into four groups according to their numerical strength. Those with a million or more members are as

follows: Catholics 17,316,673; Baptists 9,216,562; Methodists 9,119,069; Lutherans 2,806,797; Presbyterians 2,677,369; Disciples of Christ 1,988,392; Protestant Episcopalians 1,254,227, and Congregationalists-Christians 1,048,281. Those over 500,000 and under 1,000,000 are Eastern Orthodox 711,925; Latter Day Saints 689,363; Reformed 563,148. Those over 100,000 and under 500,000 are United Brethren 417,594; Evangelical Synod of North America 257,724; Evangelicals 237,270; Brethren 166,851; Adventists 162,391; Assemblies of God 107,641; Friends 107,201, and Mennonites 100,924. Then there are many others that come under 100,000. The whole list, including three varieties of Catholics, fifteen varieties of Baptists, sixteen varieties of Methodists, seventeen varieties of Lutherans, nine varieties of Presbyterians, two varieties of Disciples of Christ, ten varieties of Eastern Orthodox, two varieties of Latter Day Saints, three varieties of Reformed, two varieties of United Brethren, five varieties of Adventists, four varieties of Brethren, four varieties of Friends, seventeen varieties of Mennonites, and a multitude of varieties of all the others, making about 215 varieties of Christians, are separated from the others and most of them not on speaking terms with other groups. The work of this generation is to correct these ugly attitudes. There is nothing in the Christianity of the United States more important than healing these running sores of scandal. Christians who are contented with these conditions need to ask themselves afresh as to their relation with Jesus. Is this his will? Can he look upon these churches with any other attitude but pain? What satisfaction is there in recrucifying Jesus in the home of his friends?

P. A.

THE IRENIC SPIRIT AND CHRISTIAN UNION

By Rev. Frederick D. Kershner, LL. D.
Dean of the College of Religion, Butler University,
Indianapolis, Indiana

THERE are two major factors in the furtherance of Christian union. The first is the process of education and the second is the cultivation of the irenic spirit. Those who are conscious of the fact that reason is fundamentally one can understand how the educational development of the Christian world will necessarily bring it into unity. The process, however, is essentially a slow one and centuries, perhaps millenniums, will be required before the adherents of Christ will become so completely dominated by reason as to be able to think together without any serious disagreements. It is obviously the duty of all Christians to forward the educational program of the church to the end that errors may be discovered and eliminated and that a common understanding may be reached by all earnest and unbiased seekers after truth. Efforts in this direction are now being made in various communions and they should be encouraged and emphasized. Nevertheless, for the present at least, the most important factor in promoting union is the second influence mentioned above, that is to say, the possession of the irenic spirit. Union by education lies in the distant future, but a large measure of harmonious cooperation may be secured to-day if the cultivation of

the spirit of active good will becomes a matter of greater concern on the part of all Christians.

I

The early Christians were held together primarily by the possession of the irenic spirit. The intellectual and social divergencies between the members of the original Jewish-Christian congregation at Jerusalem and the Gentile churches of Asia Minor were radical and profound. As Professor McGiffert has so clearly shown in his volume of lectures entitled *The God of the Early Christians,* they did not even worship the same deity. The Jewish-Christians knew no God except Yahweh, while the Gentiles knew nothing whatever about the traditional Hebrew religion and, therefore, accepted Jesus Christ as the only God. It was this fundamental cleavage which was back of the Arian controversy and its ultimate resolution in the orthodox doctrine of the trinity.

In many other respects the Hebrew Christians differed from their Greek associates. The former practiced the Mosaic Law, circumcized their children, kept the Sabbath and the ceremonial feasts, believed for the most part in the imminent and bodily return of the Messiah to set up his kingdom, and looked upon Christ as the son of God but not as the one who could be correctly spoken of as taking the place of Yahweh himself. The Gentiles, on the other hand, refused strenuously to observe the Mosaic Law, would have nothing to do with circumcision, kept Sunday, or the first day of the week, instead of Saturday, took less interest in the immediate second coming and had no regard whatever for Yahweh or any other deity except Jesus. For him they

had exchanged their ancient devotion to Zeus or Apollo or Pan or Cybele and they did not propose to accept the tribal deity of the Jews for whom as a nation they had neither respect nor regard.

It is no wonder, in view of these facts, which later investigation tends to bring out in stronger colors, that the Jerusalem council had a serious problem on its hands or that the differences referred to in the epistle to the Galatians called forth some language from the Apostle Paul which only one modern translator has ventured to render in English without a certain toning down of the epithets employed. The fact of the case is that the lines of cleavage between extreme Jewish and Gentile parties in the church of the New Testament period were really quite as radical as any which have developed later in the history of Christendom.

II

In spite of their differences the early Christians maintained a loose-jointed but sufficiently real unity of fellowship in every part of the Roman empire. Paul denounced the Judaizers, it is true, but he went back to Jerusalem to the Passover, he collected money from the Gentile churches for the needy saints who were circumcized, and when occasion demanded it, as for example in certain sections of the epistle to the Romans, he could break forth into the most fiery eulogium of the descendants of Abraham. Peter and James, on their side, tolerated the new recruits from heathendom with what must be conceded was an extraordinary breadth of vision for a Jew of any period.

They had, it is true, many and definite points in common which constituted the thread upon which their

harmony of action and fellowship depended. Without going into details, they all alike accepted Jesus as the ultimate authority in all practical religious matters. Christ had the final word both for the Jewish Christian and for the Greek. Theoretically the two groups did not interpret his nature in exactly the same way, but from the standpoint of practical authority they were absolutely at one. In Jerusalem and in Antioch, in Samaria and in Corinth the watchword—"All authority hath been given unto me"—was accepted with the same unhesitating and enthusiastic allegiance. Moreover, they had all come into the church the same way. They had all been baptized, and baptism meant substantially the same thing to all of them. There were no controversies over mode or meaning or subjects or ritual. Likewise they all observed the Lord's supper with at least a certain unitary core of content which was everywhere easily recognizable. They kept Sunday pretty universally as the day of worship and their local groups, like the synagogues of Israel, possessed such a similarity of structure as to make them distinctive in the larger social circles of heathendom.

Outside these characteristics, with perhaps a few others, the early Christians differed at almost every point.

III

If the leaders of modern Christianity could somehow secure the irenic spirit of Peter and James and Paul there would be a far larger measure of unity than obtains at the present time. The difficulty always has been that men of prominence in the various churches find it impossible to practice the kind of tolerance which was so characteristic of the Jerusalem council.

They are willing to take other Christians into their fellowship if they will "make their submission," but they have no desire for unity on any other terms. They do not want union, what they desire is conquest. Of course, a spirit like this is the opposite of the irenic attitude. It is perfectly hopeless to talk of harmonious adjustment so long as it obtains in the higher religious circles.

Froude, and other historians, have shown that there was no real necessity for a hopeless division of the church at the time of the Reformation. Had the leaders of the period, Catholic and Protestant alike, possessed the irenic disposition, it was quite within the bounds of possibility for the essential unity of the church to be preserved. What made the case hopeless was the chauvinistic attitude of the ruling popes and their immediate advisors. On the Protestant side there was a good deal of the same temper in spite of the more conciliatory disposition of men like Melanchthon and Bucer. The spirit of unity was not in the air. Men with a genuinely tolerant attitude like Erasmus were discounted on both sides and were looked upon as heretics by all parties. Prejudice, passion, and self-interest dominated the world. It was no wonder that fire and sword wrought havoc everywhere in the name of Christ. Few more sanguinary conflicts than the Thirty Years War are recorded in history. The unwillingness to adjust differences which characterized the theologians of the time bore a frightful harvest on the battlefields of Europe during these tragic years.

With the passing of the centuries much of the old time intolerance has disappeared. There is a disposition toward unity among the leaders in practically all Chris-

tian bodies. Nevertheless, there is great need for the cultivation of the irenic spirit. Of course, what we have written has nothing whatever to do with the sacrifice of principle or conviction. The thing of which we are speaking may characterize people with widely differing doctrines. Some very conservative theologians possess the irenic temper while, on the other hand, some very liberal thinkers are intolerant to the last degree. Until we can secure a wider diffusion of that uncompromising good will which was the essential mark of Christ's teaching, among all of his followers, we cannot hope to accomplish very much toward the promotion of Christian union.

FREDERICK D. KERSHNER.

FAITH

You cannot filch it from another's field,
Or buy it wrapped within a market place.
Your love and suffering alone the yield
That gives you peace and clothes your soul with grace.

—*Catherine Cate Coblentz.*

THE REALITY AND PROMISE OF CHURCH UNITY

By Rev. Richard K. Morton, S. T. M.
Minister of the Congregational Church, Revere, Massachusetts

CHURCH unity is progressing because church people are progressing in the spirit of Christian unity. I am indeed happy to support this statement by quoting from an editorial of insight, Christian spirit, and foresight which was published in *The Presbyterian of the South* of Richmond, Virginia, organ of the Presbyterian church in the United States.

"*The Christian Union Quarterly,*" the editorial begins, "is a magazine devoted to this subject. It favors church union, but it makes a clear distinction between union and unity. 'It insists that there must be the recognition of the equality of all Christians before God, before we can go very far in Christian unity.' "

Christian unity, like everything else, waits upon Christian piety. We have too long taken the organizations we have and cast around for something that they could do; now we are beginning to think first of our primary spiritual purpose and evaluating our organizations according to their ability to serve that purpose. To distinguish between union and unity is to say that men must get together before they can bring their organizations together. Union would be as bad as disunion if no more men are won for Christ, and if the church does not do more for God and more for man.

Christian unity is real because, first, it is at least the

ideal of many who do not yet see it as possible. It is real because men feel that when the spirit of Christ really works upon men in this new day, part of their response will be to readjust and erase denominational lines and bring the workers in a common cause corporately closer together.

"The fact is, there is a great deal more of unity in the Christian church than some people realize," the editorial continues, speaking truly. "In all of the principal Protestant churches there is a unity of faith and devotion to God. They all recognize that God the Father is the Creator, Ruler, and Preserver of the universe; that Jesus is the Son of God, who by his death on the cross became and remains the Savior of all sinners who put their trust in him; that the Holy Spirit is the Revealer of God's will, the Teacher of God's truth, the one who applies to the heart of the believer the benefits which Jesus purchased by his death. They all believe that the church is God's agency for the salvation of the world, and that its members should be consecrated to God's service."

Unity, it seems to me, must at first proceed along the lines of personal piety. We *believe* that God is loving, caring Father and Creator—but this is often virtually an academic theory with some, forced by logic, and not directing life. We do not *act* this faith. Unity must first be *unity in service*. There is a real sense in which it would be far better for men to get very busy serving Christ and spend less time trying to define his Person and arrange their dogmas concerning him. Men study Jesus who do not *love* him. Men express learned views concerning him who do not follow him. Disunity has gradually come from the impiety of

us all; from the fact that we have emphasized differences in dogma rather than unities of loyalty, service, and love; from the separativeness of quibbling men; and from the fact that we have been more zealous to set men right in their beliefs than we have to set them right in their lives.

I fancy myself not old-fashioned, nor even conservative, and yet I believe that what would minister more than anything else to the reality and promise of church unity would be a simultaneous revival in all the churches. If men in this busy, wealthy, arrogant, well-equipped world were brought face to face with spiritual realities, and face to face with Jesus, they would look with different eyes upon the sectarian problems. There is no denomination which is without its great men and traditions, its great records of service, its mighty inspirations, its glorious emphasis upon some cardinal truths. But to-day there is an urgency which cannot wait for the clumsy competitiveness of denominations to get under way. Our financial and social problems are too complicated to warrant unnecessary machinery of administration. Of course, some denominations must suffer loss. But, Christian men, have we no thought of what Christ and the kingdom of God are losing? Of course, we should like to have men assent to our views of Christianity — but, after all, would it not be more glorious to help them to assent to Christ's way of life? Are we winning converts for ourselves or for Christ? Are we perpetuating a system, or teaching and exemplifying life?

When a man is brought face to face with Christ, isn't he thereby necessarily at that moment at one with all those who are in Christ? How can there be disunity

among those who love and are actually following Christ and who have looked into his blessed face? We need that unity of enthusiasm, experience, and loyalty which moved men at Pentecost. They all thought of Jesus differently, without a doubt—but they all had the same purpose and went about the same task. Thus our unity is already real because we believe in God and ascribe common attributes to him. We are already united because we love Jesus, because he has helped us to see and to know God, and because he has manifested himself unto us in our own inner lives. We are already united because we burn with a passion to be like him and to bring him to others, in spite of all our different ideas about beliefs, methods, social problems, and what not. Every Christian is serving Christ. Every Christian is standing for a holy life and a philosophy of love and service. Why let the most arguable minor differences obscure these facts? Every Christian feels that the Spirit dwells in him. Every Christian indeed believes in the church—but too little does he work in it.

The promise in all this is that the more we do for Christ, the more we come together. The more we become saturated with the essentials of a religious faith, the less narrow, contentious and short-sighted we are. We are united on the things of the faith—but we allow ourselves to differ on the ways we interpret its minor points. The promise, too, is that men still love Christ above all, and he is continually working in them, so that some day before long things that are marvelous in our eyes will happen. Christ can do more for church union than commissions and conferences and discussions over the legal, financial, ecclesiastical, and clerical aspects of the problem. There is a promise in the fact that

hitherto unchallenged and unnecessary theological, administrative, and organizational baggage is gradually being cast off in the onward march of the church, as too heavy and too unessential to be allowed space. There is also a promise in the fact that men—even while still holding dearly to certain cherished traditions, methods, and polity—are beginning to put primary things ahead of important things. It is hard to leave the old ways, in which there is still much good. It is hard to sacrifice and modify points of faith and order—but the cause for which it is done should give us courage.

We are all united in the work which is cut out for us. We are all united in the enemies which we must face. We are all united in the internal problems which our churches face. And we want to meet the challenge of our day, as the great leaders met the serious challenges of their day.

"When these fundamental truths are held," continues the editorial in *The Presbyterian of the South,* "there is real unity. Any church which holds these views, and holds none that are contrary to God's word, or injurious to his kingdom, should be recognized as a true church. It should be willing to join heartily with other churches in the work of building up of God's kingdom; and all other Christian churches should be willing to work with it. To say that something that is not of fundamental importance shall decide whether a church is a true church of God, does not show the spirit of unity. For example, some churches will not admit that other churches are true churches, because of a difference in the mode of baptism. Some insist that it must be by sprinkling, and will not recognize immersion. On the other hand, some say that it must be by immersion, and will not recognize sprinkling."

Any church which, in general, builds character, serves God, and performs the works of Christ through his Spirit among men seems to me worth uniting with. The trouble with the last-quoted paragraph seems to me to lie in the fact that we too quickly take to ourselves the task of defining a true church, God's word, sound doctrine, and so on. Our legalistic, fastidious methods of holding out for meticulous orthodoxy in faith and practice may have preserved our particular brand of Christianity, but they have done incalculable harm in saving organizations rather than men. Many people to-day are classed as unchristian or non-Christian simply because the people they approached in the churches were so fiercely determined to keep everything in order as to faith and polity. When you are readier to battle for some theological dogma or practical method of church administration before you are ready to battle for some sinner's life or against some common social evil, you are on perilous and quite untenable ground. It seems to me that in many cases it would be much better for us not to look ourselves over before we start Christian thought and labors together, with a view to pointing out who is a Christian, but to wait until we had thought and worked and struggled and sacrificed awhile together, and until, perchance, the Holy Spirit might have come upon us while we were together.

"When we do not recognize a church as a true church," the editorial concludes, "we cannot work harmoniously and enthusiastically with it, even if no friction develops. Let us seek the unity of the Spirit, which recognizes every believer in Jesus Christ as our brother, and work with him in peace and love for the building up of God's kingdom."

The first sentence in this last paragraph has a different spirit from that of the second sentence. If we have the unity of the Spirit, we are not likely to be terribly concerned about judging other churches and other men. We get into disunion when we persist in defining, judging, classifying, interpreting, and trying to run things according to our own pet notions. We fall into disunion, in other words, when we allow simple Christianity to be corrupted in us by what we think, prefer to do, or decide that our fellow men should do.

We are not in a position to stop everything and sit down and patch up our denominational rivalries and differences. The church is a powerhouse supplying current that is needed throughout the night. If something goes wrong in the night or in the powerhouse, that defect must be set to rights without stopping the dynamos, for that must not be done. So church unity must ever be looked at in the light that we have men to save, and there is little time for them and for us. We have a world to enlighten and improve—and time is going on.

In this new day, if the church is to remain a world factor and uplift the lives of the masses of men, it must do more work than it is now doing. Its plant must be more efficient in its operation. Its power must be sent further. I think that more men are impelled toward church unity by their sense of man's need of God than they are because of minor imperfections in the belief or polity of any denomination or denominations.

If our churches get together, it will not be because we have managed to outvote the Presbyterians and have proved that the Methodists are nearer right; it will not be because we have successfully denied something that

any other denomination stands for—it will be because in Christ's Spirit we want to do something for his sake. It will not be because we are on the wrong track as Congregationalists, Universalists, Baptists, and so on, but because we realize together that we are on the wrong track as Christians and see a better way of working together for the kingdom of God. With that spirit we can ultimately solve our hardest problems.

RICHARD K. MORTON.

TO ONE WHO OVERLOOKS MY FAULTS

I heard it said that Love had lost his sight,
And could not judge aright.
Nothing could be more false!! Love is not blind,
But only very kind—
For, on occasion, I have seen him place
His hands before his face,
And turn away, in utmost charity,
For what he *would* not see!

—*Sara Henderson Hay.*

THE LIVING CHURCH: ITS UNITY*

By Rev. J. Vernon Bartlet, D.D.
Oxford, England

Our subject is the unity of the church as a "living" society, a society pulsing with a life proper to its nature, and thus having within itself power to play the part assigned to it in the great world-plan of God for humanity. If, however, we are to see this special aspect of the living church to-day with sure and clear vision, we must view it consciously in its true perspective as part of a whole.

The *authority* of the living church or divine society consists essentially *in its gospel,* the intrinsic truth and power of its glad message of a gracious, heavenly Father, entrusted to it to live by, and by living it out to become its primary witness. So Dr. P. T. Forsyth argued in a memorable utterance as far back as the Boston Congregational Council of 1899. But, as he too recognized, the authority or moral sovereignty of that message consists further in its being the continuation and extension of the life-witness, in word and deed, of "the true and faithful witness," Jesus Christ, the fountain-head alike of the church's special life and witness. By shedding his life-blood for the fulfilment of his vocation, as given by the heavenly Father, he both sealed his own witness and gave it *redemptive power* for men, *through the*

* A paper read to the Pan-Congregational Council at Bournemouth, England, in July, 1930, with some additions bringing it up to date in view of the Lambeth Conference of 1930.

distinctive quality of his personality, as at once representative Son of Man and archetypal Son of God. Thus having become potentially Lord and Head of a renewed humanity, Christ became forthwith Lord and Head of the church, *God's special society within humanity.* Through it, as the embodiment of its Head's distinctive spirit or life, the complete renewal of humanity is in process of realization by the energy of the Spirit of God, now active with new efficacy, both within and without the church, in virtue of Christ's historical person and work.

If, then, the church is to function as a living power and fulfil its divine destiny, this will be in the exact measure in which it has living relations with its Head, through whom it draws from God, the Father of man's personal spirit, its vital resources, both for itself and for its part in the redemptive work of grace in all men. In other words, the church is distinctively *the society of the Christlike;* and inasmuch as the quality most distinctive of Christ, its Head, is love — in the new Christian sense, of which his historic personality is the one adequate revelation — the most exact synonym for "a living church" is "a loving church." Let me repeat it, for it has been sadly obscured by the church's history, both past and present, and yet is of elemental importance: the church, as Christ meant it to be, is "living" just *in so far as it is "loving,"* as he was and is loving. In so far as it is otherwise, it has only "a name to live, but is dead," as his church, whatever its ecclesiastical or institutional status of constitution, whether as regards sacraments, ministry, creed, cultus, or other forms of its organized being. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another." For "God

is love"; and men, as redeemed by being lifted, through death, to their native egoism (determined by their physical and psychical past), on to a new and morally supernatural plane corresponding to the creative idea of manhood (symbolized by the story in Genesis), are made actual "partakers of the divine nature" as children of love.

But such love is not, as is so commonly assumed, a thing beyond moral control, and therefore no proper subject for divine command to all, as Christ implies it is. Rather is it the natural reaction of man's emotional nature to the supernatural gospel of the Fatherly grace of God, revealed to the uttermost of self-giving for man in the Cross of Christ. It answers to the gospel's new valuation of man, as in idea fit to be the object of God's marvelous redemptive love. Thus the love of the true church of Christ is inspired love, "the love of God" for personality as latent in man, and is "shed abroad" in believing human hearts "by his Spirit." Therein lay and still lies the promise and potency of a world-wide revaluation of all man's existing values touching both himself and his fellows, of whatever estate or condition. It is in virtue of this, and this alone, that the gospel is the one final world-religion. In this light manhood first stood forth as, in God's purpose and provision, sacred, worthy of awful reverence for his Maker's and Redeemer's sake, and with a new meaning of transcendence amid the sum of things we call the universe. Relative to such a being "brotherhood," as the correlative of divine Fatherhood revealed in grace, gained a fresh depth of meaning and sincerity.

It remains still to mention one other outcome of all this, perhaps the most important of all for the basis of

church unity: I mean *reverence for* Christian *conscience* touching God's will in Christ. This rules out all coercion by the church of conscience in its members, whether severally or in organized groups, as a method for attaining unity. This principle was first set forth by St. Paul in his classic plea for mutual consideration of conscience in Rom. XIV. Christians in saving relation to the church's Head are to be "received" in full communion, apart from differing views as to such applications of that relation in practice as are not made clear by the word of his gospel. As examples of such doubtful points Paul specifies the observance of certain sacred days—Sabbath, Sunday, or other—according to current ideas of a hallowed day, and the use or non-use of certain foods held by many to be religiously defiling. Right observance here was held by some in itself to qualify the believer for full churchmanship; while lack here had the opposite and disqualifying effect. In so thinking they were guided by pre-Christian prejudices, particularly of the Jewish order. How besetting these could be, is shown by the fact that Peter and Barnabas for a time were swayed by them to deny full church fellowship to uncircumcized believers in Christ (Gal. II). Indeed it seems that only Paul's superior insight saved the apostolic church from actual schism into two parts, viewed by one, if not both, of them as *on different levels of acceptance with God*. There was indeed an extreme section of the original or non-Pauline type which even denied to the other type of believers in Christ any such acceptance, and therefore any part or lot in his salvation. This latter position answers to the Roman Catholic attitude to-day while the former anticipates the Anglo-Catholic one in practice toward non-episcopal communions.

Against all this, Paul lays down the principle that such differences ought *not* to be a *ground of mutual judgment* between Christians: they were matter for each man's conscience toward the Lord himself, in a sphere of liberty where each could be condemned only by his own act, *i.e.*, by adopting an attitude about which he himself had doubts. For "whatsoever is not of faith," in the sense of conviction as to the Lord's will, "is sin" to him who does it. This principle Paul finally carried to victory in the council of leaders at Jerusalem, which resulted in a temporary concordat on that basis, one which recognized the manifest tokens of God's Spirit at work among both types of Christians as decisive for church status. This settled for all time *the master-principle of church unity.* It is just a corollary of the very idea of church fellowship, *viz.*, Christian love, which looks not only to its own things, even the things of conscience, but considers also the conscience of others, and shrinks from insisting on freedom for one's own conscience at the price of grieving or weakening the conscience of a brother needlessly. Let there be no mistake about it: *church unity must rest on brotherly love as its one basic principle.* But Christian love implies liberty of conscience on both sides, as before the same Lord. Apart from this in practice, to speak of Christian love is self-delusion. And it is on these twin principles, so far-reaching as in fact to cover all that divides Christians to-day into different communions, that I would now concentrate attention, and sketch out some of their practical applications to the present situation.

In so saying, however, I do not forget that some would deny the relevance of the analogy of the situation either in Acts xv or in Romans xiv to our own, which

turns on the relations of Catholicism and Protestantism as age-long, historic bodies of church principles. Accordingly they would deny also that the principles just cited bear on the present case at all. For the matter of ministerial order, as conditioning the grace of the sacrament of holy communion, is in fact held by consistent "Catholics" of all types to be an integral part of the very gospel itself, so far as this contemplates the Christian salvation as the life of a society of an institutional type, determined by divine constitution or law. Here lies the real *crux* of the whole matter, *viz.*, in *the legal element* still persisting, according to Catholics, in the gospel, under the form of a divine ritual directly resting on commission from the church's Head, for the authorized appointments of its ministry, both for word (in the complete sense) and sacraments. Divine law, it is urged, warrants *the method of moral coercion,* by the denial of church fellowship to those who by their own choice are without the said sole legitimate ritual; upon which depends, in turn, an assured share in the grace, at least in its fullness, of the sacrament of church fellowship with the Head and his members.

To those who thus think, the deepest life of a living church is bound up by divine decree with "apostolic succession," not so much in the apostolic gospel as in *apostolic orders,* as qualifying for its full and sacramental ministry. Truly an astounding proposition for one judging simply by the apostolic writings, and particularly those of St. Paul, to whose intervention the church catholic, whether in the technical or the wider sense, historically owes its very being as more than a second-class appendage of proselytes to the divine Israel of God, on its originally Jewish-Christian basis. In those

writings there is no explicit or indubitable assertion of any such exclusive grace of apostolic orders, as possessed by themselves for the administration of the holy communion, and still as transmissible to any other body of men. *The very idea of transmission* of any such commission was absent from the thought of the apostolic age, if only for the simple reason that no succeeding age was looked for, in view of the expected bodily return of Christ within the first generation of the church's life. The whole Catholic notion in the matter is thus a pure anachronism. But if so, the matter must remain for us all one of "doubtful disputation"—in St. Paul's language in Romans XIV—for the Christian conscience, save on the *a priori* hypothesis of *church tradition as infallible* in its interpretation of what was originally entrusted to it by the apostles, whether in the abiding form of written words or in the changeable form of oral teaching. This is the logically consistent theory of Romanism; and it alone can bear the weight of the exclusive claims which other types of Catholicism would fain build on their basal principle.

I repeat, then, that the Christian conscience cannot, under a non-legal gospel such as Paul championed, rightly be confronted with *episcopacy as indispensable* before God, or "in the court of conscience," to normal church fellowship or the grace of any Christian sacrament. That episcopacy is for practical purposes indispensable for our realizing, within any time that the human mind to-day can forecast, that working church unity among Christians of a world-wide or Catholic kind which is now felt to be so needful, is a very different proposition. It is one of which I myself am deeply convinced as a matter of the higher expediency, in the

interests of the whole church and its work in the world. But the adoption of episcopacy on that basis must come about for reasons manifestly integral to the essential spirit of the gospel, as a gospel of mutual love between the members, not of a divine state or polity, but of God's "family of faith." *The morally coercive method of Catholicism,* in trying to impose on all consciences its own theory as to the nature of episcopacy, is alien to the very spirit of Christ, which here is surely self-evidencing to all Christians as such.

But in fact the great Lambeth Appeal of 1920 carried us far beyond the point of the traditional "Catholic" estimate of *the Christian character and value of the non-episcopal communions,* to which, among others, it addressed its fresh call to unity. That appeal was on a basis not excluding but explicitly, and even thankfully, including the recognition of diversity of gifts of insight and of earnest endeavor to embody what of the full and richly variegated wisdom of God, contained in reserve for all, each communion had been able to receive, in trust not only for its own children but also for the whole Body of Christ. Of that one church each Christian communion, in spite of external division, still remains a living part. The fact that it has proved so hard for the bishops who issued that Appeal for "unity in diversity," and a diverse rather than uniform unity, to act up to the level of the vision of fellowship in Christ's one church which lay behind that Appeal, only shows more clearly how truly inspired of God was that historically unique appeal. I for one cannot doubt that it was not only epoch-marking but also epoch-making. Things can never be as before, between us and the Anglican communion. For those who responded in

any real sense, the old sharp antithesis of Catholic and Protestant has gone for ever. Evangelic Catholicism and Catholic Evangelicalism have begun surely, however gradually, to replace them; and practical results for unity are bound to follow. Inter-communion must come, and that before very long, in some form or other. Already we have the most important acknowledgment made by an official Anglican committee of bishops and other divines, that certain non-episcopal ministries are, after making all deductions, "real ministries of Christ's word and sacraments in the universal church."

A result of a more immediately practical kind is the South Indian scheme of reunion, whatever its exact issue in the near future. That depends not a little on the Lambeth Conference just about to meet. Besides conceding an important principle to be mentioned lower down, the attitude it took to the South Indian scheme was one of benevolent, if non-committal, encouragement to the dioceses directly involved to go forward on the lines followed thus far, in the hope of further adjustments to meet conscience in all concerned. And to a real, if less degree, upon ourselves and those whom we here more or less represent.

Yet another was the Lausanne Conference on faith and order of 1927, when seen in its true light and perspective. It met simply to take stock of the existing situation as regards actual differences of conception and the degree of unity in underlying ideas tending to draw all together, and thereby to learn how to surmount those differences as barriers to religious inter-communion and so to full coöperation in the work of the kingdom of God at large, on the lines of the Life and Work Conference of 1925 at Stockholm, and face to face with

other religions. On the basic subject of the Gospel, those met at Lausanne, including even the Oriental churches which take their stand on orthodoxy of creed and customs, found themselves in essential unity and were able to frame an agreed report as to the church's message—an unparalleled thing, and one surely of momentous import for the future. Thus the *ultimate* basis of unity was recognized as already laid of God himself in the heart of the various communions, a fact which the papal type of Catholicism denies in principle. Thereby a new type of Evangelic Catholicism or Catholic Evangelicism stood forth confessed to the whole world, on the one foundation of which St. Paul spoke long ago. This is none other than Christ himself as "clothed in his gospel" savingly experienced—to use the historic phrase of the most truly catholic-minded of the Fathers of the great Reformation, Philip Melanchthon.

It is true that when we passed—I speak as one who was there and breathed the wonderful spirit of unity in Christ felt by all in that unique assemblage—to formulate our conceptions of the concrete institutions in which the gospel has come to be embodied in our several theologies and church practices, difference clearly emerged at certain points: yet, be it noted, it was difference in reflective or intellectual conceptions of the understanding, rather than in intuitive perceptions of the ideas and values of church, creed, ministry, sacraments. To the positive meaning and worth of these for us all we gladly made confession, distinguishing the *how* from the *what* of the grace involved in each, as the gift of God to his church. Thus even here the note of unity was very marked, though by some—the extremists on both sides, *i.e.*, those hankering most after agreement on

the intellectual guarantees of like spiritual institutions in living experience—the differences were felt yet more.

So much, then, for the present situation. What emerges from it as to the future basis of unity is to my mind quite clear: the one possible basis is *comprehension on principle,* to be attained by way of convinced "faith" in it as God's will and way for us, and *without the pressure of moral coercion of conscience* in any by the conscience of any. That is the golden rule of the Lambeth Appeal, *viz.*, "God wills fellowship" only through mutual consideration of conscience, in its positive aspect, namely as holding certain distinctive points of emphasis in trust for the whole church of God. Thus the road to greater unity is that of *spiritual enlargement of sympathy,* and of the insight which goes along with it. *Amplius* should be our watchword all round: let us learn what others have to which we have been largely blind. Thus, while Congregationalists are, as Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson in *Foundations* handsomely recognizes, perhaps the most catholic-minded of all denominations, owing to their having no church idea in the "connectional" sense (including Anglicanism), to compete with the idea of the one church in the absolute or all-inclusive sense, they have yet much that is precious in practice to learn from the traditional or historical type of episcopate common to Catholics at large. It has been, and may be on a larger scale in the future, the *effective symbol of solidarity throughout the church* in its organized or visible aspect, giving largeness of outlook and feeling for that church, both in time and space, for its continuity and capacity for organized unity of action. We have only to remember the Lambeth Conference of bishops, as of men habitually the responsible, normal

centers of organic unity over large parts of the church's being as the Body of Christ in this visible, concrete world, meeting together to realize and express the corporate mind of their communion; and then compare a Congregational council of delegates *ad hoc,* meeting for a week and then relapsing into their several varying contexts of local church life and experience. Surely the difference springs to the mind's eye. Their greater solidarity too we ought to have, and yet so as not to undo or forego what of distinctive value our emphasis on the local unit of the one church's life of and for fellowship has given us.

Need I say that the episcopate which I contemplate, and ask you to contemplate, as likely to be one day a coördinating and unifying factor in the living church of the future more adequate than it is now, alike as to the church idea and to the function entrusted to it in God's world-purpose for mankind, is *not the historic episcopate just as it is or as it has been* for most of its long history? Rather is it one modified as regards its self-sufficiency, and too often autocracy, by the complementary forms of church organization for which Presbyterianism and Congregationalism have stood historically, and the value of which is recognized in the Lambeth Appeal. This is what is meant by the phrase, a "constitutional episcopate," very much the type both contemplated and embodied in principle by the South Indian scheme. In order, however, to secure such *comprehension of differences in the unity of the Gospel of Christ,* savingly experienced and evidenced by the fruits of the Spirit, the inclusion of elements hitherto distinctive of Catholic and Protestants must be largely on a persuasive, not a compulsory or uniform basis. *The*

Spirit of Jesus cannot be at home with or make terms with compulsion; such was the testimony of our Separatist Congregational forefathers, and of the later varieties of the same type known as Baptists, Friends, and certain other more modern forms such as the Disciples in the United States of America. This, too, broadly speaking, is the most striking and hopeful feature of the South Indian scheme, which is therefore a genuine Christian concordat. Christian liberty, on the basis of love for conscience in all, is its key; and without this there can be no real advance in unity. Those Anglo-Catholics who refuse such liberty on principle have no proper part and lot in the Lambeth Appeal of 1920, and no *rôle* to play in the future of Anglicanism as a bridge church. It has been such already, in its own past and present union of Catholic and Protestant features; and, please God, it may afford an object-lesson and concrete basis for boundless possibilities of yet wider and more conscious developments of the principle set forth so persuasively, and in so Christian a spirit, in its Appeal of 1920.

Postscript. The Lambeth Conference of 1930 reaffirmed explicitly the ideal of reunion enunciated in so prophetic a key in 1920. But dealing, as was now its business to do, mainly with the difficulties of practical application to actual conditions of long standing, it conveyed to many readers of its report the impression of a certain change of accent toward non-episcopal communions. This was due chiefly to two circumstances which gave its program for the time a special perspective and emphasis.

(1) One was the fact that the Eastern Orthodox and the Old Catholic communions, episcopal in order

and having most affinity with the Catholic or pre-Reformation elements in the Anglican tradition, were represented by authoritative delegations ready to explore terms of closer relations in the future; whereas conference with the English Free churches, which had been taken up immediately after 1920 and had reached a certain point, was at a check which neither side had a plan for overcoming to the satisfaction of the other's conscience. The movement, then, was not thought to be ripe for taking any fresh practical steps in that direction just then. But there was another factor which the bishops felt might indirectly help toward the future resolution of the *impasse, viz.*, the experiment being contemplated under the less rigid historical conditions of the mission field in South India. Thus in giving the South India scheme a favorable hearing they felt they were in effect doing something to prepare the way for the resumption of negotiations with non-episcopal communions at home.

(2) Further, in this conversation a real advance in principle was in fact made, though its far-reaching importance has been largely overlooked owing to the limited field to which it was actually applied. For with South India and other mission fields in mind, it was laid down that an Anglican bishop could sanction mutual church hospitality in the crucial matter of sharing in the holy communion of the Lord's supper, between Anglicans and non-episcopal Christians, where either was so far out of reach of facilities of their town type as otherwise to be deprived of this means of grace altogether.

The epoch-making significance of this lies in the fact that non-episcopal communions are here treated,

for the first time in any official Anglican document, as real means of grace for Anglicans and not only (and that precariously) for the members of the "church" in question. This virtually carries with it the essential principle upon which alone reunion can be based, *viz.*, mutual recognition of the churchly character of certain non-episcopal communions and the validity (as distinct from the equal regularity) of their ministries, or real ministries not only of the word but also of the central sacramental means of grace in the church of Christ.

This being admitted in principle, the range of its practical application becomes only a matter of the *bene esse* and not the *jure divine* "essence" of the church on earth, as heretofore with so many Anglicans. The fact that the operation of the rule now adopted by the whole Anglican episcopate in solemn conference is still only permissive, and dependent on the adoption of it by each bishop in his own diocese (and primarily in intention under the conditions of the foreign mission field), cannot alter the crucial importance of the principle involved. It is for non-episcopal Christians henceforth to bear this in mind, and in case of need, but also in a considerate spirit, to remind their Anglo-Catholic brethren of it—not forgetting how hard a thing it must be for them to readjust their thoughts and feelings to such a change of perspective, even on the authority of the Anglican episcopate as a whole. "God wills fellowship," and larger fellowship than heretofore, but only on the basis of loving regard for each other's conscience, as Lambeth, 1920, pleaded.

J. Vernon Bartlet.

I DO NOT BELIEVE IN FOREIGN MISSIONS

By REV. FRED SMITH
Minister of the First Congregational Church, Newton, Kansas

THE words, "I do not believe in foreign missions," coming from one who ministers regularly in a church which, last year, was the only one of the larger giving churches of its denomination in its particular state to pay its "benevolences in full," by December thirty-first, sounds contradictory. But things are not always as they sound. The difference is the difference of a paradox, and that augurs well for the Christianity of both facts. I have mentioned this paradox to indicate that, whatever be my objection to foreign missions, it does not arise from parsimoniousness. It is to be feared that many a man's opposition to foreign missions is due to a misguided notion of thrift rather than a right apprehension of truth. Concerning this, more later. Meanwhile, it will be well if I give attention to the straightness or otherwise of my own disbelief.

I do not believe in foreign missions on, at least, two counts. Let us give attention, first, to the smaller of the two. The emphasis is wrong, in two respects. Christianity is friendship or it is nothing. But what has friendship to do with "missions"? Much every way, provided it be not forgotten in the warmth of one's uplift. One can appreciate the intention, while looking askance at the methods of the old time missionary, who

thought of his work largely in terms of a faith that had run over into fanaticism. Between that day and this in the work of "foreign missions" there is the difference of a world. Those men of another day were other-worldly. They would save the heathen from hell. That was enough. Now "foreign missions" thinks in terms of this world. It would save men to health, to wholeness. This achieved, hell will take care of itself. The ethic remains unchanged, the emphasis is changed.

There is need for further change yet, but the change needed now is more than a change of emphasis; it is a change in ethic. I have already indicated that while I am a disbeliever in foreign missions I am a believer in friendship, world friendship. The hasty speaker is apt to retort that here is a distinction without a difference. In this retort he is in error. There still is worth in words. An ill chosen vocabulary can easily lame one's virtues. I heard a preacher declare recently that "John Wesley saved England from a reformation," which, so stated, was an untruth. What he was trying to say was that "John Wesley saved England from a bloody revolution which made possible the realization of a peaceful reformation." Words are the currency of thought, and have importance for culture and Christianity as coins have for our commercialized industrialism. The time has come for the re-minting of our religious currency in the interest of a wiser friendship.

Say "missions" long enough and a man will become the fanatic of a cause rather than the maker of friendships. It is easier for a man to be a compeller rather than a comrade. In the older days of missions, the mores of that time being friendly to this sort of thing, it was

customary to "compel" the heathen to come in. In proportion as a man or a sect thinks of Christianity in terms of propaganda there is always a latent danger of an atavistic throw-back to the use of force in the interests of a faith gone fanatical. If one has attended here at home "revival meetings" it is not necessary to go farther for illustration of what I mean here. It should not be hard to see, however, that in so far as Christianity becomes a form of compulsion instead of being a fact of comradeship, in so far has it ceased to be itself.

Happily there have been many factors making for a changed emphasis in Christian service in our time. Science has put out the fires of the old fashioned hell and destroyed the literal gold plated heaven, while at the same time revealing a sort of hell and heaven possible right at our feet. This, along with other factors cultural, has already given us a significantly changed emphasis in "missions." Now men go out to serve rather than to save. The trail of an improving morality is always to be found in its changed metaphors. A faith interpreted as related to fanaticism runs to "missions"; but interpreted as friendship it runs to mutuality. And that is some difference. In the one religion is a one way street; as was the "foreign mission" way of other days; in the other, religion becomes a two way thoroughfare, as is becoming manifest in our day.

But the barriers will not all be down until we know what to do with our adjectives better than at present. The day is coming when the phrase "foreign missions" will be a despised phrase. We have heard a lot in our time about "the importance of foreign missions," but in that day we shall come to know something of the

impertinence of foreign missions. Yesterday's good always looks dark in the brighter light of to-day's sun. When religion becomes friendship "foreign missions" will have ceased to exist. Instead of the old sense of "missions" there will be the new fact of mutualism. This distinction should be enough to anticipate those who will say that though the vocabulary is changed the duty remains the same. Upon that we have some thoughts coming, and that right here.

There was One in old time who spoke of the need for removing the beam from one's own eye ere the task of removing the mote from a brother's eye was undertaken. In passing I draw attention to the fact that the work of removing the mote was an act done to a "brother"; that is, it was a friendly work. Masefield saw, without so drawing the conclusion, what Christianity means when he makes the converted Saul Kane say: "I knew that Christ had given me birth to brother all the souls on earth." That is the one task for Christians, to brother men.

But to speak of "foreign missions" is to cast a shadow, if not something more across the path of that relationship. To walk even a shadowed path is for the Christian to strangely betray the religion promulgated by One who called himself "the Light of the world." The word "foreign" is an adjective that needs careful, or rather, Christian watching. Unless this be done, it is apt to tincture all our work with something other than the faith we profess. In this way. Note the current, which is not the Christian, use of the word, foreigner. The foreigner is always the beneath one, the inferior. It is a term that trips easily from the tongue of

the superiority-complexed ones. It is the speech of the proud, and, usually, as inflected, of the prejudiced. Even at its best, so far as Christianity is concerned, it is a left over of a tribal-nationalistic day whose very foundation was other than Christian. The sooner a Christian deprovincializes his speech the better for his Christianity. Institutional Christianity has too much derived its speech from the vocabulary of Cæsar with a hundred deflecting results. Christianity should begin other than with the man-made assumptions of men's inherent differences; it should begin in the faith of man's inherent divineness. He spoke the thing we need to know here who said "that nothing that is human is foreign to me." That is to say, the Christian cannot believe in foreign missions for the simple reason that foreigners, for him, are non-existent. It is accounted a virtue by many professing Christians that they are internationalists. In this they have accommodated themselves to Cæsar. But

> In Christ there is no East nor West,
> In him no South nor North:
> But one great fellowship of love
> Throughout the whole wide earth.

When it comes to Christianity a Christian becomes a supernationalist. Some day we shall find it is a greater thing to be human than to be humanitarian, as it is harder to be just than charitable.

Unless a man or sect have care the Christianity they export is apt to be a condescension rather than a comradeship. Many missionaries have given pity to the world in the name of Christ. It was a sorry gift. They

have only the Christian right to give sympathy. Unless Christianity is given sympathetically it is poison, not power. Pity is the virtue of the condescending: sympathy is the virtue of the Christian. It means the giving to each other the best that we have. Christianity is more than "foreign missions"; it is human mutualism. Beginning from this base we can build to heaven. Without it we build on an inadequate foundation. A Christianity, tinctured with Pharisaicism, by so far fails to reach the width of its usefulness. They who speak of "foreign missions" are looking at the world through colored glasses. If they know this it helps; but if they do not know it, it hurts, both themselves and those whom they seek to help. A Christian, anywhere, should be something more than the citizen of the country where he happened to be born. He has been "born again." All else is incidental to that. This is the second count we mentioned.

It is strange how many problems disappear when one takes that viewpoint. When we ask concerning men how divine are they, rather than ask concerning them how different they are, we are on the way to progress and purity. But when we build our hopes on a work that is labelled with the fact of a difference we have crippled ourselves at the first, where, as a matter of fact, we ought to have Christianized ourselves. Wherefore I repeat, "I do not believe in foreign missions." But I do believe in brotherhood. And that is some difference, as a rule.

FRED SMITH.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

Faith and Order at High Leigh

The Continuation Committee set up by the Lausanne Conference on faith and order in 1927 met at High Leigh, England, August 18-21, under the presidency of the archbishop of York. Between eighty and ninety members were present, representing the churches of the British Isles, of the continent of Europe, and of America; and covering the whole range of the various Christian communions, from the Eastern Orthodox to the society of Friends. Rome was the one conspicuous absentee. For the rest, we had one more example of the new spirit and the new conditions in Christendom inaugurated at Stockholm and Lausanne after the war. Anglican and Lutheran, Presbyterian and Orthodox, Baptist, Methodist, Independent, Quaker, met in the most frank and friendly conference upon the things that matter most to them all—a thing almost unthinkable a generation ago.

We discussed with complete candor—all the cards on the table—the great question of faith and order opened up at Lausanne in 1927, and we gave our minds to the practical business details necessary to the continuation of the work begun there. The immediate objective before us was the second Lausanne Conference, now fixed for 1937, and we all envisaged an indefinite series of such conferences in the future. For no one contemplated the idea that the churches of Christendom, having once got upon such a footing with one another, could ever break these links and relapse into our old suspicious aloofness. It is true that the question addressed by the Lausanne Conference to the various

churches had not in all cases met with a response as wholly encouraging as some had hoped. But this was taken as a call to further effort on the part of those who have the vision of Lausanne before them. It is also true that some representatives had to report that the shadow of Lambeth had fallen with chilling effect upon the minds of some members of their churches, especially, it appeared, in America. There is certainly here an unfortunate misunderstanding. The bishops clearly miscalculated the effect that their words would have upon Free churchmen; and equally clearly the Free churches misunderstood the intention of the bishops. But it is just because such misunderstandings arise that the work of "Lausanne" is so important.

For "Lausanne" exists for the purpose of exploring the causes of misunderstanding. It has no mandate to promote any particular policy of reunion between sections of the church. Its aim is precisely to bring and keep together representatives of all the churches in the united effort to understand one another. And it was certainly good for representatives of the Anglican and the non-episcopal communions of the west to meet together in the presence of other Christians, detached from the immediate problems that agitate them, and to renew their discussions of the broad issues. That real progress has been made in the direction of mutual understanding became strikingly clear. Some time ago a theological commission was set up to consider the doctrinal differences between the churches. They took as their first task the study of the doctrine of Grace. Their interim report presented at High Leigh is a most significant document. It shows to how large an extent our differences are due to the fact that the churches have developed in isolation their own systems of technical ideas and terms, until one church does not understand what the other really means by its language. When their doctrines are "decoded," so to speak, a quite astonishing measure of agreement is recorded upon the

fundamental religious facts which the various doctrinal systems seek to express and safeguard.

By avoiding the technical expressions which have for centuries been the watchwords of controversy, and getting down to the realities they were intended to express, the theological commission was able to present certain agreed statements which went astonishingly far. This is not to say that our controversies are merely about words, or that all our differences can be explained away. But it does become plain that the real lines of deep divergence are often not what we thought they were, and that they sometimes run not between one denomination and another, but actually through a single communion, whose members nevertheless live together in the unity of a particular church. The theologians are about to publish a large book upon the subject of Grace, and it is safe to say that no such monument of united Christian thought has appeared since the break-up of Christendom. It will evidently be read with eagerness by all students of theology.

But it was made clear at the High Leigh conference that the re-statement of our doctrinal positions is only a part of our task. The theologians of to-day may do much to undo what the theologians of the past achieved —the erection of impassable doctrinal barriers between the churches. But the positive work of reunion needs something more than the theologians as such can do. We must learn to share each other's life of faith, devotion, and religious experience. During the conference a Russian, Professor Arseniew, of Königsberg, begged us not to be content with comparing our doctrines, for example, of the sacrament, but to tell each other what the sacrament means to us in our own lives. If we cannot have immediate intercommunion, there is a kind of spiritual intercommunion which we can have by sharing our experience. So great is the uniting power of the sacrament that even to speak of it to one another must bring us closer. His words were

echoed in various ways by other speakers, and found general response. We have felt it laid upon us to be prepared at our next conference to tell one another as simply and frankly as possible what we find in the sacrament, which belongs to us all though our doctrines interpret it so differently. Meanwhile the theologians will be investigating the doctrine of the eucharist, and the two lines of thought should meet in a far deeper and clearer understanding of our several positions.

For the rest, the committee was much concerned with ways and means both of continuing and extending its own work, and more particularly of communicating to the churches at large that which we seem to have found, and of drawing a large measure of support and inspiration from our fellow-members in our various communions. The British group of the committee hopes during the winter to initiate locally efforts toward this end.

[From Professor C. H. Dodd in *The Christian World*, London.]

Should the Commission on Faith and Order Be Continued?

Has the Commission on Faith and Order accomplished all that the church had a right to expect of it? It was launched in a time of great enthusiasm for unity and with high hopes. Its work was financed originally by a generous gift of a layman who held no rigid ecclesiastical views of either orders or sacraments. But, as a commission, it seems fair to say that it has stood with no open mind for the ecclesiastical order of this church, and has insisted that there is to be no fellowship at the Lord's table until such order is agreed upon by all Christians. Neither of these positions, we believe, has the support of the people of the Episcopal church.

The vital question of church unity cannot wisely be left to ecclesiastical experts, any more than the question of national disarmament can be left to military and naval experts. There is a widespread popular interest in unity and the leaders of the church are not leading. When our bishops came back from the Lambeth Conference last year and were asked what that conference had done in regard to the unity of the established church and non-conformity in England, they replied that the Non-conformist leaders seemed to be more opposed to unity than the members of Non-conformist churches. A similar criticism may be directed against our own leaders. Church unity will come from below, from the people demanding it as something required by the fellowship and love of Christ. It is the function of leaders to express and guide the popular interest and desire.

Church unity cannot be expressed in terms merely of faith and order. Questions of creeds and ministry have frequently been only the camouflage of disunion; the real causes of division have been social, economic, nationalistic, and sectional. Why a church north and a church south in some of the communions? Sectionalism and the Civil War, not faith, give the answer. Why the Baptists in the Southwest, Methodists in the Northwest, the Disciples in the Mississippi Valley? Not order, but the frontier with its emotional and individualistic needs, explains. Why are the Irish Roman Catholic, the Scotch Presbyterian, the English Episcopalian in the United States? These differences find their origin in the nationality of the various elements which make up the American people. So there are churches of the middle class, the well-to-do, the poor, and churches of the cultured and the uncultured. To concentrate our thought on faith and order is to eliminate vital factors from the problem of church unity. Even if they were to reach a general agreement on all the four articles of the Lambeth Quadrilateral, the churches would still be as far apart as they are to-day.

We would have our church join the Federal Council of Churches, as the expression of our desire to coöperate with the other churches of our country; and we would have our communion continue its coöperation with the Eastern Orthodox and other churches in the faith and order movement. The one stands for unity in Christian America, the other for unity in modern Christendom; one is national, the other international in character. To continue the Commission on Faith and Order and to reject the invitation of the Federal Council would, we believe, be inconsistent on the part of our leaders and in no sense an expression of the hope and thought of our people. Of both these policies we may say, in the words of our Lord, "this ye should have done and not to leave the other undone."

[From *The Churchman*, New York.]

Another Lausanne Conference

The World Conference on Faith and Order was held in Lausanne in 1927. It was suggested at that time that another conference of the kind should be held at some time in the future, if it should transpire that such was the desire of the communions who have been associated in the movement. It is now proposed to hold such a gathering in 1937. There has already been considerable discussion of the subjects that should be considered at such a conference and those that are tentatively put forward cover much the same ground, though from somewhat different avenues of approach, as those that were considered three or more years ago. Additional light upon the questions at issue would be furnished by the responses to the Lausanne reports which have been received from churches around the world. There has been formed by the Continuation

Committee, also, an international committee of theologians who are engaged in a study of the doctrine of divine grace, the interpretation of which affects so deeply the questions at issue in any movement toward Christian union. Their report would be a part of the proposed conference.

Now comes Mr. Arthur Porritt, the distinguished editor of *The Christian World,* of London, asking the question as to the holding of another Lausanne, "Is it worth while?" and returning a rather emphatic negative to his own question. "I submit," he writes, "that another Lausanne Conference is not worth while."

The reasons for that conclusion Mr. Porritt gives in forceful fashion. He thinks the first conference was "an elaborate futility" because, whereas for the first ten days the atmosphere was full of the promise of some definite progress toward unity, in the end "the Anglo-Catholic delegation deliberately wrecked the conference." He recalls that the high churchmen balked at a joint communion service, that the Greek Church delegates felt constrained to wash their hands of responsibility for the findings of the conference, and that, finally, "a little group of American Anglo-Catholic Episcopalians, led by Bishop Manning, Dr. Morehouse, and Dr. (now Bishop) Craig Stewart, engineered a conspiracy which blew up, sky high, the one report of the conference which would have sanctioned the only single practical step towards unity." So he considers that the Anglo-Catholics "slammed the door upon Christian unity and bolted it." He believes also that subsequent events give no evidence that the Anglo-Catholics have had any change of heart.

To this it may be said, first, that there is reason to believe that the Anglo-Catholics will not dominate another Lausanne as they did the first. Certainly they will not if other Christian bodies are adequately and as ably represented.

It may truthfully be said, in the second place, that the Lausanne Conference, in spite of minor regrettable incidents, did an enormous amount of good. It dispelled misunderstandings, promoted mutual acquaintance and fellowship, interpreted the denominations to one another, and cleared the way for more intimate contacts still. Though the Lausanne reports disclosed many points of difference, and some of a stubborn sort, they established wide areas of agreement. The report on "The Church's Message to the World," which even the Orthodox signed, was later reissued as its own statement by the Jerusalem Missionary Conference, and it may be claimed that we have in it the most widely accepted statement of faith since Nicea. The intimate association of widely differing minds is necessary for that sympathetic understanding and mutual esteem which is essential even for that effective Christian coöperation in which as Baptists we profess to believe.

Should Baptists be represented at another Lausanne? Beyond a reasonable doubt they should, and by their ablest leaders. President Hibben, of Princeton, appealing recently for America's entrance into the League of Nations, declared: "Whether we like it or not, there must be a recognition that we belong to the great family of nations. Our home is the world, and any policy of isolation held by any one in this country is in danger of stultifying the people who hold it." This principle applies as truly to denominations as to nations. Anything that is of deep concern to Christendom at large is of concern to Baptists. The principles for which Baptists stand they must share with the world. Whatever others have to contribute to the enrichment of their experience, Baptists want. We must not permit any complex of superiority or of inferiority to betray us into a self-centered isolation.

[From *The Baptist,* Chicago.]

The Anglicans and Free Churchmen

The work of bringing the separate branches of the Christian church into closer unity proceeds; but it is in the nature of the case that it must proceed slowly. Nor is it to be expected that the pace will be even at all times and in all places. Certain combinations of circumstances will make here for swift development, while elsewhere other circumstances will dictate a pause. What is of importance is to seize the moments that are favorable, and to refuse to be discouraged when for this or that reason the pace must be restrained. The point that must be firmly grasped is that the work goes on.

These reflections are specially applicable to the course of events as they have affected the relation of the church of England to other religious bodies during recent months. Last March the archbishop of Canterbury sent an invitation to the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free churches expressing his earnest desire for the resumption of the friendly conversations on reunion which had been suspended by mutual consent in 1925. This move was greatly welcomed by many Anglicans when it was made, because it was felt that misunderstandings had arisen since the last Lambeth Conference on the Free church side, which it was most desirable to remove. If progress was to be made, it was from the Anglican side that the initiative would come with best grace. The response to this invitation has naturally taken some time to mature because the Federal Council had first to gather the opinions of the different churches that compose its federation.

It has always been a little difficult for Anglicans to discover why there has been such acute disappointment as undoubtedly exists in some Free church circles with regard to the results of the last Lambeth Conference. A curious idea has prevailed that in some way the promise of closer unity held out in 1920 was dashed in 1930—though in fact the South India scheme was a step

forward of a most unexpected kind. It should have been impossible for any representative of the Free churches who took part in the conferences that followed 1920 to share this view. It may be that, at first, interpretations of too emotional a character were put on the encyclical of that year, but its exact import and possible lines of development were made abundantly clear to both sides during the close and intimate discussions that were spread over the five years that followed. What did those five years reveal, and why did the conferrers at the end of them mutually come to the conclusion that a pause had better be made? The center point of discussion was the episcopate, because it was the point where differences were felt to be most acute and vital. The corollary of this is sometimes forgotten, namely the existence of a great body of teaching and devotion which is held in common. But the nature of the ministry is not a matter that can be slurred over or evaded, and this these discussions proved once more. They also revealed that when the meaning and function of the episcopate as an integral element in the development of the Christian church is squarely approached many of the objections that are thought to exist on the Free church side disappear. Its value was quite definitely recognized in certain Free church circles; but not in others. What, however, appeared even more plainly—and subsequent discussion in this country has confirmed the impression there produced—was the gap that existed between some of the leaders of the Free churches and their followers who had not had the opportunity of considering the subject of the ministry afresh as had those who had taken part in these conferences. Those on the Free church side who were disappointed with the findings of the Lambeth Conference had failed to note the lesson of these discussions. There are still large numbers of Free churchmen who are indisposed to accept the episcopacy in any shape or form. What some on that side have really been asking is that Anglicans shall completely

abandon a vital element of their ecclesiastical structure.

As has been already said, there is a large field in which Anglicans and Free churchmen can work together without any awkward questions being raised—but in which they do not work together as they should. Here it must frankly be admitted that the fault is often on the side of the Anglicans. The suggestions of the Friends of reunion at Birmingham, if acted upon, would, in course of time, produce an entirely different atmosphere. Whatever may happen to those in charge of official negotiations, here is a field ready to be cultivated in every town and rural district throughout England. It is good that private groups of theologians should be meeting to get closer to one another in regard to such questions as grace, the church, and the ministry. But it is at least as important that every parish priest and Free church minister should feel that they are comrades in a common warfare.

[From *The Guardian*, London.]

The Anglicans and the Old Catholics

Historic memories are evoked by the Bonn Conference. The report of the latest conference to be held in the Rhenish town shows clearly that a great step forward has been taken in promoting closer relations between the church of England and the Old Catholic churches. The meetings between the representatives of the two communions that took place at the time of the Lambeth Conference had helped to establish a mutual understanding. Not least significant—in view of past history—was the fact that all three bishops of the Old Catholic church of Holland, the oldest and most conservative of this group of churches, had thought it worth while to come to England to confer with the

Anglican bishops. Two definite results were achieved. The Lambeth Conference agreed that there is nothing inconsistent with the teaching of the church of England in the Declaration of Utrecht—the formula that was drawn up in 1889 as the common basis of all the Old Catholic churches. Further, the archbishops of Canterbury and Utrecht were invited by the conference to appoint a joint doctrinal commission to discuss points of agreement and difference between the churches. The document that has just been issued is the report of that commission. A study of its personnel shows at once that the commission was adequately representative of the different strains of thought in the church of England. It is, fortunately, much more difficult to label Anglican divines precisely than the world at large is accustomed to suppose.

The report is short but pregnant and unanimous—striking both in what it asserts and in what it omits. Its main point is a clear declaration that the commission is of opinion that the time has come for complete intercommunion between the two churches. "Each communion agrees to admit members of the other communion to participate in the sacraments." This does not mean that, if the decision of the commission is endorsed by the authoritative bodies of each communion, the Anglican church and the Old Catholic churches will either of them be merged in the other. Each recognizes, according to this formula of union, the independence of the other, and maintains its own. Neither holds itself bound to the acceptance of all the doctrinal opinions, sacramental devotions, or liturgical practices characteristic of the other. At the same time, each acknowledges the catholicity of the other and each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian faith. The most striking omission is the absence of any statement of the faith held by the two churches. At one stage, the report shows, there was some idea of drawing up such a profession. But it was abandoned on the ground that

it was undesirable to draw up a new creed since both sides were satisfied with the old ones. Thus the omission is but another witness to the fundamental unity that the conference revealed.

The report shows, however, that the discovery of this unity was only achieved after careful discussion of possible divergences of opinion. Both sides had questions to ask. Broadly speaking, the difficulties that required to be overcome were the questions raised on the Evangelical side in England since the Lambeth Conference report was published. These questions and their reactions would seem from the report to have been the main matters discussed at Bonn. That this was so is all to the good, because it is of the first importance that the Old Catholic churches should be made fully aware of the diverse tendencies of interpretation put upon the Anglican formularies by different sections of opinion within the church of England. It is not less important that the more conservative section of Evangelical churchmen should be able to feel that their position had been fully considered. That this was the case is evident from the report. The Evangelicals had an admirable representative in the Principal of Wycliffe Hall who, as the bishop of Gloucester witnesses, played a very important part. He had prepared a very full statement of the Evangelical position after consultation with friends in England who had been disturbed by the Lambeth Report, and this was handed to the Old Catholic representatives for their information.

Among the important points that have been cleared up are the following. The definitions of the sufficiency of Scripture, as given in Articles VI and XX, present no difficulty to the Old Catholics, whether Dutch or German. Their doctrine is, indeed, substantially the same as that of the "Commonitorium of St. Vincent," to which they — in common with many Anglicans — attach importance. They put the first four general counsels in a different class from later councils. Dis-

ciplinary authority only is ascribed to the seventh; and the fourth lateran council and the council of Trent are not regarded as œcumenical at all. The Declaration of Utrecht is intended to exclude transubstantiation in its medieval sense. The idea that the Old Catholics taught that the eucharist is a propitiatory sacrifice in the sense of repeating the sacrifice of Calvary is dispelled. The Old Catholics have discovered that no parliamentary sanction will be needed for intercommunion, and that the assent required to the Thirty-nine Articles is only of a general character.

It now remains for these agreements to be implemented. The Old Catholic decision will presumably be made known at Vienna. The church of England will presumably express its mind in the convocations in November. If success attends these efforts the church of England will gain by finding itself once more in full communion with a devout and devoted body of Christians on the continent of Europe and in America. The Old Catholics will gain by association with a church which enjoys a world-wide opportunity.

[From *The Guardian,* London.]

How the Churches Coöperate at State Universities

No accent is more clear in the early history of higher education in this country than religion. In every instance, religious concern motivated the founders of our colleges and universities. In a pamphlet of 1643 it is stated concerning Harvard that it was founded to "advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity dreading to leave an illiterate ministry to the churches." William and Mary was founded in 1693, "that the church of Virginia may be furnished with a seminary of ministers of the Gospel." The charter of Yale records that its purpose was that men "may be fitted for public

employment both in church and civil state." Princeton, founded in 1748, had as its "chief aim" furnishing the church with "a pious and learned ministry." Columbia's charter states, among other things, that "the chief thing that is aimed at in this college is to teach and engage the children to know God in Jesus Christ." The charters of Pennsylvania, Rutgers, Brown and Dartmouth also show the genuine religious interest of their founders.

Advancing beyond colonial days to the national period of our history we find the same religious motivation in the founding of the denominational colleges. Denison College, of the Baptists; Ohio Wesleyan, of the Methodists; Oberlin of the Congregationalists; and Wooster of the Presbyterians, are all fair examples of the interest in Christian education. In our country higher education is the child of the church and remained under the control of the church until quite recent times.

The rise of the state university since the middle of the last century brings us to a new juncture. Our federal law which separates church and state makes it impossible for a state university to make provision for religious instruction. This means that we have approximately 400,000 young men and women getting their education under secularized influences. The state does not disbelieve in religion, it just leaves it out of the educational process.

Most of the administrative officers and teachers at these tax-supported schools welcome the approach of outside religious agencies as they try to meet this situation. This is not only the conviction of those whose primary interest is in the advancement of the cause of Christ. It is also the judgment of the administrative officers and professors on the campus. While the officials cannot make the university responsible for Christian work, they are usually sympathetic toward any move the church may make along this line.

At almost the very beginning of these schools, the

Y.M.C.A. caught the vision and began to function on the campus in the interest of religion. This movement did a pioneer work. No other agency was active; it had the advantage of being independent of denominational control. The church will always be indebted to the Association for the manner in which it met the situation. Yet, with all its praiseworthy features, the church came to feel that more needed to be done. Twenty years ago, when the church saw her young people go to state universities in increasing numbers, she realized the tremendous significance of this. As a result we have the coming of the university pastor. The major denominations, through their official boards, created departments for the development of this new phase of religious work. The Catholics have their national student organizations known as the Newman clubs. The Methodists have the Wesley foundations, and the Presbyterians the Westminster clubs. Other denominations have similar organizations.

One of the most heartening phases of the new movement is the tendency of the denominational university pastors to work coöperatively. The average layman sees no real reasons for a multiplicity of denominations, and the impatience with divisions is intensified in the student mind.

This interdenominational mindedness on the part of the church representatives expresses itself in various ways. At Cornell University, for example, practically all the university pastors (including the Jewish rabbi and the Catholic priest) have headquarters in the same building on the campus. At the University of Pennsylvania, under a similar plan, all the religious work is unified and integrated in the Association building. The latest interdenominational work to be organized along this line is at the University of California. At East Lansing, Michigan, there is an interdenominational agreement which binds together four great denominations as the People's church for the common purpose of

"ministering to the religious needs of the student body of Michigan State College and the resident population of East Lansing, Michigan."

Another phase of this merging of interest is found in the interdenominational university pastor, as at the University of Montana, where several denominations, in coöperation with the local ministerial association, support one man who is to work on the campus as the representative of a united Protestantism.

The path of advance in meeting the university challenge is in this direction. If the church is to meet, on the one hand, the growing dislike of denominational emphasis and the signficant opportunity, on the other, it will have to confront the campus with a unified program and leadership. Certain values accrue from such an approach which can be had in no other way.

The present writer served for a number of years as an interchurch university pastor. At the very outset of his ministry he was given an unusual introduction. The ministerial association of the city which sponsored the movement, sent a letter to every clergyman in the state, saying that "it is not the thought that the appointment of the interchurch university pastor will relieve the churches and pastors of the city of any obligation to minister to the university constituency. There will be the utmost coöperation with him. He stands to minister impartially to every group, including those who have no church affiliation or preference." It was his experience that several projects could be attempted on the campus which would have been embarrassing had he represented but one church. When school opened in the fall and a freshman convocation was called, he spoke to all on the religious side of student life. He rendered a service by the use of a circulating library on such major themes as "Belief in God," "The Personality and Message of Jesus," "Science and Religion," and "Missions." He organized the faculty into a group for the purpose of conducting a religious

forum. By this and other means a most sympathetic attitude was developed among these professors in their relationship to the church.

In visiting a class in French, it occurred to him that the students might be interested in a bilingual Testament. He explained the nature of these Testaments and showed how one could gain a knowledge both of languages and the Bible at the same time. As many as 250 students at one time were thus studying the New Testament in a foreign language. In visiting a professor of sociology, he learned that the professor knew very little about the official position of the church with reference to social religion. He therefore secured information from the social service departments of the major denominations and was given the professor's class of twenty-seven high school teachers for such time as was needed to present the social thought and activity of the church in our own time. This proved so profitable that other classes in the department were turned over to him for the same purpose.

Another illustration of a fruitful field of service was among the foreign students. He took a group representing three different nations—Russia, Germany, and the Philippine Islands—to churches where they were invited to speak, and thus contributed to a better understanding among nations and of the foreign missionary enterprise. These foreign students also carried on activities in the interest of world peace throughout the entire state. An international orchestra of twenty-four pieces was organized by one of the Russian students and concerts given both on the campus and in the churches of the city. These students should go back to their respective countries as ambassadors of goodwill, as many foreign students do not. In more than one case, a student has been won from a purposeless life to the cause of the Christian movement in his own country.

Will the church meet the present-day challenge of the universities of our country? The answer to that ques-

tion will be found when we answer another one. Are our churches willing to forego their special denominational interests for the cause of Christ?

[From William Lindsay Young in *The Federal Council Bulletin*, New York.]

Education for Human Brotherhood

We are still dominated by what Francis Bacon in the early seventeenth century called "idols." One of these present day "idols" is the assumption that a method of teaching that fits *one* mind must consequently fit all minds, and so we forthwith proceed to "wholesale" our supplies of truth to all who come, instead of studying individual aptitudes and adapting our method and our technique to fit the special needs of the particular case.

Another one of our "idols" is the fetish we make of educating for "credits" instead of educating for ends and values of life. We are busy asking what will get a person on from one grade in the educational factory to another as though he were a Ford car, instead of asking what will make a person richer and deeper in character. A disillusioned college president tells us that "students are considered as so many logs of pulp-wood to be turned into a certain number of paper degrees at the end of the senior year." Sooner or later we must smash that old bastile of examinations and grades and find new and freer ways of discovering and estimating intellectual progress. That will be the beginning of a new day. It may be said emphatically that education which focuses on passing off examinations is not in any true sense real education. Few things do more to develop hampering complexes in children and youth than do the grueling fears of grade examinations and the depressions that result from psychological tests.

Another of our "idols" is our fancy for a vast variety of casual lines and fields of scrappy information instead

of the mastery of some continuous, unified, coherent and cumulative plan of work that brings a growing interest to the student and the steady development of his mental powers. A few subjects pursued with diligence and accurately mastered give a far better basic education for life than does a multitude of half digested fields of study. Time spent in getting a thin smattering of one or two foreign languages, not sufficiently mastered to be of any practical use or to supply any formative culture, is time wasted.

The most ominous of all the educational "idols" is our excessive emphasis on the mere accumulation of information and our failure to stress the importance of *formation* of personality, the cultivation of imaginative power and the appreciation of those things by which men truly live. Professor Whitehead, with his usual insight, says that "a merely well-informed man is the most useless bore on God's earth." These are some of the "idols" among others that must be smashed before there can be again, as in Bacon's time, a new "advancement of learning."

Fortunately the dawn is breaking and the new day is at hand. It has already begun in many places, especially in the lower grades of education. What is now called "progressive education" has passed beyond the experimental stage and is proving to be the inauguration of a new epoch for the child. Nearly every hope I have expressed as achievements of the new day has been already realized in some degree in some of these "progressive schools."

The culture of imagination, which I should consider the highest mark of successful education, has been carried to a very high level in more than one school. Hugh Mearns in his interesting book, *Creative Youth,* has shown how a school can set free the creative spirit and in his reports of actual work he has supplied us with a new basis of faith and hope for an era of creative education. Everybody who teaches knows what the arousal

of interest and expectancy is the essential task that confronts the teacher. The "project method" has proved to be an immense stimulus in this direction. It introduces creative ingenuity, it gives scope for muscular activity and skill, it develops originality and leadership, it appeals to the dramatic instinct, it arouses international interests and sympathies and it gives every member of a class something personal to do. The springs of curiosity and discovery are brought into play and education is linked up as it ought to be with actual living. One of the most important laws of character formation is the law that control of instincts and emotions is best secured by the organization of systems of interest, or systems of sentiment and loyalty, under the guidance of ideal aims. The best "progressive schools" have been strikingly successful in that constructive task of education.

History teaching ought, as far as is humanly possible, to be liberated from the incubus of propaganda. One of the most terrible devises for the distortion of truth, and for the permanent injury of *souls,* is the use of a history class-room for the cultivation of hate in innocent young minds toward the people of a rival nation or race. It is bad enough to use the scenes of past battle-fields for the purpose of arousing national pride and for glorifying one country at the expense of another, but it is far worse to make use of battles and of the enflamed passion that has been born of past wars to create a new passion in the hearts of children that can be cashed in as an asset toward preparation for new wars. History impartially taught can be made one of the most potent forces of culture for the discovery of the laws of life and for the formation of social ideals. The honest use of it as a genuine method of culture ought to be as sacred an obligation to the teacher as is the impartial study of the laws of nature.

It is peculiarly important that all education should clearly bring out the fact that no one in this world *can* live unto himself, that one person alone is no person,

that every individual is like the half of a return ticket, "no good if detached." The selfish aspirations of a boy, his decision to aim to get his own isolated pleasure, his snobbery toward others, would tend to fade away and weaken if he were made to see with clear insight that there can be no such thing as an "isolated" person, that it is as impossible as having a stick with only one end to it, that in actual fact we are all "conjunct" with others in life, in interests, in gains and in relationships and that consequently we must share ourselves and surrender ourselves and give ourselves if we are to make any kind of life that is worth living.

Some of our greatest authorities in science are telling us that the most inclusive law in the universe is the principle of concretion or organism, or, as General Smuts has called it, "organic wholeness"—the tendency to produce *wholes out of units*. If the principle is a sound one, as I believe it is, it means a momentous revolution in thought. However important the "unit" may be it can never be comprehended until it is seen as a "cell" in a larger organic whole. We do not understand an "atom" until we know how it is bent to conjoin with more atoms to form a "molecule" and the molecule, again, will have its *nisus* toward a larger whole. As soon as life emerges the *organic* feature is even more in evidence and we find ourselves carried on and up from single "cells" to ever higher organic wholes. A man is an immense congeries of coöperative cells, but a man is not a "person" until he, too, finds his place in a living cooperative social whole, of ever more inclusive scope and range. Genuine education in the future must aim to train personal units to become living, coöperative parts of inclusive social wholes.

Every opportunity must be seized during lessons and in sport to drive home the importance and the significance of coöperation. Young people need constantly to gain insight into the value of understanding other persons' minds and thoughts and emotions, and with

these processes should go the cultivation of respect for personality at every stage of its development. Everything should be done that can be done to illustrate and demonstrate the effect of getting the other person's point of view and of coördinating with others rather than aiming to outdo and to worst those with whom one has dealings. The cultivation of kindness and thoughtfulness in all relations toward those who have physical defects and peculiarities is an essential part of true education and it ought to extend to differences and peculiarities of race and color, so that it becomes "second nature" to be respectful to persons of other races.

In speaking favorably, as I have done, of progressive education, I do not want to say anything that would imply sympathy with any methods of education that neglect mental or moral *discipline*. I do not believe that robust personality can ever be formed without a constant insistence on the restraints and sanctions of nature and the no less important sanctions and restraints of society. If there is to be any freedom that is based on reality, it must be a freedom that respects everybody else's rights and, too, a freedom that conforms to the eternal nature of things. It takes long experience to discover where the curve of freedom runs and the wise teacher must not let those in his charge suppose that freedom is a soft and easy thing.

I am convinced that there ought to be a good deal of experimental work done on the deepening and expansive effects of silent meditation for children and for the discovery of ways to feed and fertilize the deep sub-soil of the child's mind out of which his ideas and his volitions emerge. When anyone discovers how to stir the deeps within, to free the child from fears and to bring this deep-lying life of the individual into closer relationship with the essential Life of the universe, great moral energies are liberated. Schools, which for one reason or another, do not have a daily period for Bible reading or Prayers would find a short period of corporate silence

of great value for deepening the life of the children and for training them in control and concentration. It would be well if everybody gave some time each day to consider seriously his own deepest aspirations and to ask himself in a silent confessional what are his most cherished ideals for his life.

In connection with discipline and control every one needs to receive instruction both by practice and teaching, in the use of gentle forces. It is a well-known fact that persons who shout and scream and threaten have no power of discipline. A calm and quiet tone and manner accomplish vastly more than storm and bluster do. Every way that can be devised of getting moral results by other methods than resort to force should be tried, if, for no other reason, because of the educative effect of it on the pupils and students themselves. There are few things more worth learning than the secret that the greatest forces are *soul-forces,* that the supreme power of one life over another one lies in the spirit and not in the muscles.

It is a notable fact that the children in schools which are efficiently using progressive and creative methods test in mental scope and power all the way from six months to two years ahead of the average in other schools. Interests are quickened, imagination is kindled, loyalties are formed and there is a steady, unconscious pull forward. Discipline has ceased to be a major problem for teachers, and parents in many cases have found their children almost re-created by their newly awakened interests and expectations.

What we need to do next is to adapt and carry these successful new principles of education up into the work of the college. Good beginnings have already been made in some institutions. Way must be opened for an increased degree of individual initiative for search and discovery under expert guidance in place of the general lecture method. To a large extent the trained tutor must supplant, or in any case supplement the lecturer,

and that will sooner or later end the great factory system of education in favor of a small, compact college of hand-picked, wisely guided students, every one working under expert direction. Each student's work must become more correlated and concentrated and he will be tested on it to discover his insight and mastery rather than his capacity to pass off a given course.

The present system of high-powered, competitive mass athletics with its commercialism and its close kinship to professionalism, must give way to real sport of many types, with the opportunity for every student to play some game himself instead of being lined up to produce mass enthusiasm for the inspiration of a few highly trained players in an arena.

The tide has already turned, the new and deeper currents of thought are in evidence. The wiser leaders are conscious that the whole business of life suffers and goes awry as soon as the meaning and significance and high destiny of life fade away. That means that the scientific method of approach in all college work must be supplemented and balanced by a discipline of philosophy, by the study of the fundamental nature of mind and by a consideration of the central values of life and the social issues of it, as they have been revealed in the spiritual history of the race.

Science has given us a new perspective in its prediction that man has a prospect of a thousand million years more to go here on the earth. That opens up quite a vista of hope, no doubt, but it does not guarantee *progress* unless we ourselves take the steps that will achieve progress. And the most important single step is a progressive and creative educational system for the children and youth that God has given us.

[From Dr. Rufus M. Jones in *World Unity Magazine,* New York.]

Christian Unity in China

I now wish to direct our thought to the consideration of that task to which we are peculiarly committed, *i.e.*, the furtherance of church unity here in China. Our church was born through our common conviction that nothing short of a united church could satisfy the will of God, could adequately witness to the truth of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, our Lord, or would be sufficient for the task of the church in China in this day of national reconstruction.

Let us not forget that the Chinese church in the National Conference in 1922 declared itself as follows:

> Denominationalism, instead of being a source of inspiration, has been and is a source of confusion, bewilderment and inefficiency. We recognize most vividly the crying need of the Christian salvation for China to-day, and we firmly believe that it is only the united church that can save China, for our task is great and enough strength can be attained only through solid unity.
>
> We believe that there is an essential unity among all Chinese Christians, and that we are voicing the sentiment of the whole Chinese Christian body in claiming that we have the desire and the possibility to effect a speedy realization of corporate unity.

The church of Christ in China is an effort to realize the aspirations of Chrinese Christians as above expressed.

When our General Assembly was organized in 1927, it stirred mightily the hearts of Christian men and women in the West. There was deep rejoicing everywhere in the fact that such a large body of Christians was able actually to realize organic Christian unity. But we must remember that our objective has not yet been achieved; that our work is not nearly completed; that it is our task to pray and to plan and to work until all the different denominational groups within the Christian movement in China have made their contribution to a nation-wide united church. If we cannot achieve more unity than has already been achieved, we will have to acknowledge in deep sorrow that this great promise of

practical church unity has been impossible of realization.

Guiding Principiles in Seeking to Achieve Church Unity

The road which we mapped out for us to travel toward the achievement of church unity has these characteristics:

The unity is to be achieved not on minimums, but on maximums. Denominational groups are to become constituent parts of the church of Christ in China, not by being obliged to discard those distinctive teachings and practices which have been their treasured heritage in the past and which God through his Spirit has blessed. But on the other hand, we are to seek to have each enter into this united church, bringing their distinctive contribution for the enrichment of all, and each being enriched by the distinctive contribution which all the others make.

To make this first principle effective, there is a second principle which has contributed to the measure of church unity which we have already attained, and which principle we must continue to observe—the recognition of each other's faith and order and ordinances as being mutually Christian and bearing the seal of God's approval and power.

The third principle which we have employed to guide us on this untrodden way toward church unity is the principle of unity without uniformity, demanding only such uniformity as is necessary for orderly administration, permitting such elasticity in administration and organization as to permit experimentation and spontaneity on the part of our Chinese church, to discover ultimately a form of church organization which will at the same time embody those features which have been the *esse* of the church throughout these 1900 years, combined with such *bene esse* as will make it truly indigenous and expressive of Chinese life and culture. By

following this principle, the church of Christ in China will, I believe, ultimately achieve a uniformity, but it will be a spontaneous, living uniformity of belief and organization and worship, instead of being mechanical, lifeless and superimposed.

Practical Problems in Our Way Toward Church Unity

This General Assembly, therefore, should in line with these three principles courageously face some of our practical problems. Let me enumerate them:

There are some denominational groups who are hesitant about becoming members of the church of Christ in China because formal creed subscription is required of office bearers in the local churches and district associations, while the historic position of their own denomination has been averse to formal creed subscription. There is no doubt that such denominational groups are just as loyal to the religion of Jesus and have retained true doctrine just as successfully as those who historically have practiced creedal subscription. Would not the three principles above enumerated lead us to admit such denominational groups as constituent parts of the church of Christ in China, permitting them to make formal creedal subscription an optional procedure? This would enable such churches and district associations as feel the importance of creedal subscription, still to observe such a practice, while those who do not recognize the value in such a procedure could refrain from having their officers conform to this practice; and finally, out of the friendly interchange of their mutual experiences under the guidance of the spirit of truth, there would ultimately emerge a common practice.

Likewise, there are churches who feel very strongly that the church of Christ in China should express its Christian faith somewhat more at length than is now contained in the Bond of Union, formulated in Article 3 of the Constitution. To meet the desire of this group

it has been suggested that we adopt as an expression of our faith and message the statement of faith, which was formulated by the World Conference on Faith and Order which met at Lausanne and was later on embodied in the Message by the enlarged meeting of the International Missionary Council at Jerusalem. This proposal comes before the General Assembly from the General Council, and I commend it to you for your sympathetic consideration.

Then, there are other denominational groups in China who desire very much to become a constituent part of our church of Christ in China but still to maintain an intimate fraternal relationship with their mother church of the West. Would it not be possible for this General Assembly to declare itself favorable to the admission of such communions to the church of Christ in China, while permitting them still to maintain all the relationships with their mother churches of the West, short of administrative control and organization, respecting which they should be an integral part of the church of Christ? In fact, if the older churches of the West would still desire to have their younger church participate in their ecclesiastical councils without requiring reciprocal courtesies, would there be any cogent reaons why such an arrangement should not be permissible?

There are denominational groups who are hesitant about becoming a part of the church of Christ in China because of the difficulties in the way of immediate administrative integration with district associations and synods in regions where such churches and our church are both found. It will readily be seen that complete integration can very likely be most successfuly achieved not through an immediate merging of the two organizations, but by a gradual process of integration along some such lines as these:

(1) The respective councils might agree to hold their annual meeting at the same time and place, arranging for joint sessions of devotional and inspirational nature.

(2) Arrangements might be made for each to have one or two ex-officio members without vote on their respective executive or administrative committee.

(3) A co-ordinating council might be organized, to which gradually more and more of the activities of the two separate councils could be referred until circumstances would make possible the realization of complete administrative unity.

Then there is also that large group of independent churches scattered over this vast country. Our church greatly needs their spirit of self-reliance and the many other elements of strength which these churches possess. We believe too that there is much that our united church can contribute to their life and work, which would make their inclusion within our united fellowship spiritually profitable and desirable. Many of these churches are fearful lest they would lose their highly prized freedom by becoming members of the regional district association. Is it not possible for us to devise a way whereby such churches can perhaps be related, through some specially organized agency, directly to the General Assembly, if not to the synod, and in this way have them become a constituent part of our united church? This would be considered as a temporary relationship until such time as each of these independent churches will find it agreeable to relate itself to the regional district association and synod.

[From A. R. Kepler, General Secretary of the General Assembly of the church of Christ in China.]

Congregationalists and Presbyterians Unite

On Oct. 1, 1930, the Hyde Park Congregational church, with a membership of 413, and the Hyde Park Presbyterian church, with a membership of 1,090, merged under the name of "The United Church of Hyde Park (Congregational Presbyterian)." Back of this merger is a story which may interest those contem-

plating similar mergers in other communities. I will relate it from the Congregational angle from which I saw it.

As early as 1928 a number of the leaders of the Congregational church began to speak of the advisability of merging with some other Protestant church in the community. There were three motives behind such talk. One was the increasing sense of wasted money and spiritual energy in the multiplicity of liberal Protestant churches in the neighborhood of the University of Chicago. The second was the fact that our church plant was becoming old and greatly in need of repair. A third was that many of the old families who had been the financial backbone of the church had been gradually leaving, due to death or removal to other cities.

Informal approaches were made first to the Unitarian church, our nearest neighbor. But these did not develop adequate enthusiasm from either of the respective congregations. Next, similar advances were made to the Hyde Park Baptist church, and were received so heartily that negotiations soon became formal, with the approval of both congregations. The necessary committees were appointed and plans of merger drafted. These negotiations, however, came to a sudden stop when they encountered an unexpected difficulty.

The obstacle was the old question of baptism by immersion, but it was not a matter of doctrine; rather it was one of policy. It had been commonly understood that the Baptist church would be the building used by the two congregations if united. The proposed plan was for each congregation to maintain a separate corporate existence, for purposes of denominational connection, but to act as a single unit in worship and in matters of the local community and parish. There was no question about the privilege of baptism by immersion for all new members received on confession of faith into the Baptist part of the union. But there was a very real question raised concerning the privilege of baptism by sprinkling

for new members received into the Congregational part of the union. Probably not one of the Baptists in the negotiating committee felt that baptism by immersion was essential to salvation, and probably not one had any affection for this particular method of baptism. Under the constitution of the Northern Baptist Convention, however, a church which permitted any form of baptism except by immersion would automatically cease to be a Baptist church and would be deprived of representation in the Northern Baptist Convention and its national councils. The Congregationalists, of course, could not ask new members to submit to baptism by immersion. The question which the Baptists had to decide, therefore, was: should they go on with the merger and permit baptism by sprinkling and thus cast themselves out of the Northern Baptist Convention, or should they give up the merger and remain in the Northern Baptist Convention in the hope that they might be a liberalizing influence there? They chose the latter course and the negotiations ceased. No ill feeling resulted, for both bodies realized the importance of a local church maintaining its national affiliation.

The Congregationalists were a bit discouraged about tackling any further merger propositions, for we felt that if we could not make a go of it with such a fine group as the Hyde Park Baptists we could not succeed with any other group, so we began to plan on going ahead along our own denominational lines. Then one day an informal approach was made to us by the Presbyterians, who had just lost their pastor and felt that they were in a transition stage. They, too, had been impressed by the wasteful multiplicity of churches in our neighborhood. We Congregationalists, however, felt that we would run into an insuperable obstacle in joining with the Presbyterians, because in the Presbyterian church the property is held, not by the local congregation, but by the Presbytery. When we were assured that the Presbytery would permit the merger

and that the United church could hold the joint properties without domination by the Presbytery, our fears were swept aside. Committees were appointed, and after many hours of conference they came back to their respective congregations with a plan of union involving the following major features:

1. The name of the united church should be "The United church of Hyde Park (Congregational Presbyterian)."

2. A suitable corporate charter should be secured under the laws of the state of Illinois.

3. *Membership.* The membership of the United church should consist of the rolls of the members of the constituent churches and no member should forfeit membership in the national organization of the Congregational church or the Presbyterian church by membership in the United church. New members might be received into either the Presbyterian or Congregational churches if they so desired.

4. *Trustees.* A body of twelve trustees, selected equally from the two congregations, should administer the property. The existing properties of the individual churches should be deeded to, and invested in, the United church with the provision that in the event of a dissolution of the United church the joint property should be divided between Chicago Congregational Union and the Church Extension Board of the Presbytery of Chicago, in such manner as at the time should seem equitable to the trustees.

5. *Session.* The religious, educational, community, and social work should be governed by a body to be known as the "Session," which would include the twelve elders of the Presbyterian church and the twelve deacons of the Congregational church.

6. *Benevolences.* A board of benevolences consisting of twenty-four members should have jurisdiction of the benevolences with the understanding "that an equitable and just distribution of such benevolent con-

tributions shall be made and continued to the central receiving agencies of the Congregational and Presbyterian national organizations, on the *pro rata* basis of the average contribution heretofore made during the past five years. Any member of the congregation may make special designation with respect to the disposition of his individual contributions and such special designation shall be honored by the Board of Benevolences and carried into effect."

These tentative proposals were mimeographed and presented to the respective congregations, which discussed them thoroughly and finally approved them almost—but not quite—unanimously. In the meantime Dr. Willis L. Goldsmith, in a fine spirit of self-sacrifice and coöperation, resigned from the pulpit of the Congregational church, so that the United church had the opportunity of selecting a leader who would start without having had previous affiliation with either of the local congregations. Dr. Ozora S. Davis served the United church in the interim until a suitable pastor could be found. The merger, as I have said, became effective on Oct. 1, 1930, and during the next three months Dr. Davis rendered one of the finest bits of service in his long and useful career as he welded the two congregations into one through the fire of his own devotion to their common cause. Presbyterians vied with Congregationalists in paying tribute to his powers of leadership in this critical time.

A permanent pastor has been found in Rev. Douglas Horton of the Leyden Congregational church of Brookline, Mass. He has just begun his pastorate with such a hearty good humor, coupled with deep earnestness and vision, that all are looking forward to a happy and useful epoch in the religious history of this community.

I cannot close this brief account without mentioning one other fact. The Presbyterians outnumbered the Congregationalists more than two to one, but on every committee they insisted that the Presbyterian represen-

tation should not outnumber the Congregational. This same spirit has marked all the negotiations and has melted away what little opposition there might have been among the denominationalists on both sides of the united house.

[From Fred Eastman in *The Congregationalist,* Boston.]

Our Ludicrous Labels

If we had never heard them before, and were to encounter our denominational names as designations for tribes in the jungles of Africa, our sides would shake with merriment at their peculiar sound. "Hottentot" is a short and prosaic name compared with "Congregationalist," "Episcopalian," "Presbyterian," and "Methodist." To get a similar funny combination of sounds we must go to biology and consider such tongue-twisting forms of life as "chlorophyceæ," "schizomycete" and "pezizales."

Probably the only institutions which have been more overwhelmed with polysyllabic titles than our Protestant churches are the railroads. The early promoters seem to have thought that no stock could be sold to a gullible public unless the projected road went by at least three cities, all of which must be mentioned in its name. I happen to have spent my boyhood days near a railroad which has always done a lusty business hauling suburban passengers between Chicago and Blue Island, Ill. When I first learned to read, its cars bore the inscription "Chicago, Rock Island, and Pacific." Then came a period when the stock was being liberally watered and the coaches were inscribed with the title, "The Great Rock Island System." Later an advertising man got into the picture who seems to have realized that most of the public reads and thinks in terms of one syllable words, and the same old cars were repainted with nothing on them but "Rock Island."

Dowie's Prize

Possibly we owe our denominational names to the instincts of our ancestors who desired dignified and high sounding titles. If that be so, the first prize should go to John Alexander Dowie, who dubbed his organization "The Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion"—thirteen sonorous syllables. Even Wilbur Glenn Voliva, who is no slouch at throwing the language around, could not improve it!

Thanks to the advertising gentry, the railroads have quite generally shortened their everyday names so that they can be spoken in one breath without resorting to alphabetical signal practice. Even the "C. B. & Q." is now known as the Burlington. If he ever gets a good chance, possibly the "publicity man" will "snap up" the names of our denominations in like fashion.

The Congregationalists, of whom the writer is one, have arrived in a particularly distressing state from the point of view of nomenclature. Their title is about as meaningless as an ecclesiastical name can well be, denoting a type of church government which they share with the Baptists, the Disciples, the Unitarians, and which finds its most perfect expression in the utter independency of the Jewish synagogues. In New England it is called the "Congo church." Newspaper reporters have a tendency to refer to it as the "Congressional church," and precious few copy readers ever notice the error. Anybody who tries to look up the Congregational missionary societies in the New York telephone book must run his finger down past "Congregation Emmanu-El," "Congregation Ohab Zedeck," "Congregation of Peace and Brotherhood," and a large part of the Hebrew dictionary before he finds them!

Distressing Results of a Merger

The merger between the Congregationalists and Christians has made a bad matter worse, as the names of

the denominations and of their periodicals have simply been tied together with an "and." It takes seventeen words and a total of thirty-five syllables to give the official title of the writer—and when one gets through, the listener is both speechless with wonder and at the same time utterly ignorant of what it is all about. The only sensible solution of this problem is to announce, "I have Hank Leiper's old job," and let it go at that! It is quite in keeping with the position that it should carry with it the major editorial responsibility for "The American Missionary Monthly Magazine Number of *The Congregationalist and Herald of Gospel Liberty*"—fourteen words, count them if you do not believe it!

However, this cumbersome denomination name has one advantage—owing to the inherent weakness of the flesh, it is not used very often. Denominational references are quite generally deleted from our literature. A Baptist or a Methodist could read many of our leaflets and never discover that they were not about them until they got to the last page and looked for the office of publication. An increasing number of Congregationalists have got to the point where they would like to find a new name for themselves.

What Do They Mean?

But the other branches of Protestantism are not vastly better off. They have been neither as wise nor as picturesque as the Chinese who described the differences between the Baptists, the Presbyterians, and the Quakers quite succinctly: "Much washee, little washee, no washee!" For some strange reason the major denominations have described themselves in terms of their differences in church government, possibly on the theory that an outsider would like to know who is running the show before he ventures inside of a church. But what could be more meaningless to the unsophisticated sinner on the sidewalk than "Presbyterian," "Protestant Epis-

copal," "Methodist Episcopal"? To the outsider the significance of these terms is about on a par with those of the Greek letters which adorn college fraternity houses. The Baptists are fortunate in the brevity and concrete significance of their name. We have all heard about the boy who put down his religious preference as "Ba*b*tist" when he joined the navy, "Because that was the only name of a church which I could spell!" Of the American denominations, the Disciples have the one really good name, although "Lutheran" is brief and comprehensible.

Could There Be Improvement?

But what better basis for naming our denominations can we find than the vagaries of their church organization?

The most obvious way of distinguishing them would be by their difference in belief. The Unitarians and the Universalists have tried popularizing themselves with theological titles, without much luck, which is a trifle discouraging. But the greatest objection to any such system is that most of the Protestant groups do not cherish enough differences in belief to supply themselves with distinctive names.

Possibly we might follow the example of the Lutherans and call our denominations by the names of their founders, thus perpetuating the memory of such good men and true as John Knox, John Robinson, and John Wesley. On the other hand, the Disciples have always winced when saluted as "Campbellites," while the Baptists seem to be of anonymous origin. I once bought a book to find out who was their founder, but my money was wasted. But the great objection would come from the Episcopalians, who would hardly care to take the name of the king of England who for private and personal reasons decreed that the authority of the pope should cease at the shores of France.

Another device would be to name the denominations for the part of the world where they originated. The Episcopalians would be glad to be known as "church of England" or "Anglicans," the Presbyterians might appropriate the adjective "Scotch," the Congregationalists could be called "The church of New England," and the Disciples, "The church of the Middle West." But the Baptists would again be left out, while several of the groups which originated in Germany have been trying to cover up their ancestry ever since the war.

Social Status

A more realistic method of designating churches would be by the social strata to which they appeal. The Episcopalians would become "The church of the Elegant Rich," the Congregationalists "The church of the High Brows," the Presbyterians "The church of Conservatively Prosperous," the Methodists "The church of the Common Crowd," the Baptists "The church of the Unctuous Middle Class," and the Disciples 'The church of the Small Town Folk."

Obviously there is no good way of re-naming our denominations. The old names mean nothing, while new titles would rarely be acceptable.

The real tragedy of the situation does not lie with the saints to whom our present Protestant nomenclature has become hallowed through the memories and associations of the past, but with the outsider to whom the church should appeal. Because of their complicated pronunciation and confusing connotations our denominational labels stand between the Christian gospel and the people whom it should reach. These names are a liability rather than an asset, actually standing in the way of effective religious publicity. They do not command, but rather caricature the institutions over whose doors they appear. They are barriers in the path of the gospel which all the churches are trying to proclaim.

If they cannot be changed, they had better be forgotten. They belong in that state of grace described by Grover Cleveland as "innocuous desuetude."

[From the Rev. John R. Scotford in *The Christian Century*, Chicago.]

"In Union There Is Strength"—So Testifies Ohio

One morning, a year or two ago, an executive of the Presbyterian church in Ohio and a Methodist district superintendent climbed into an automobile together and started out for a joint inspection trip over a district covering a number of counties. They spent several days in their tour, giving special attention to communities in which there were churches of both denominations, conferring between themselves and with local leaders as to the prospects for uniting some of these "competing" organizations. As one result of this trip, the Methodist and Presbyterian churches at the neighboring villages of Savannah and Nankin announced they would unite their forces in each community and work and worship together as a single local congregation in both places. Previously the Methodist churches in the two towns had shared the services of the same Methodist preacher, and the Presbyterians had divided a Presbyterian minister's time between them. By the new arrangement, an experienced Methodist rural leader has moved into the Presbyterian manse at Nankin to direct the work of the combined congregation on a full-time basis there, and an equally capable Presbyterian pastor has taken charge at Savannah. The agreement provides in each case that the succeeding pastors shall alternate in denominational affiliations, Savannah's next minister to be a Presbyterian and Nankin's a Methodist.

This pair of local church mergers reveals the friendly spirit of coöperation that prevails to-day among denominational executives in Ohio, and the willingness of

local congregations to respond to suggestions for church consolidation. The full-time, experienced pastoral leadership secured for these two united churches illustrates the type of benefit that more and more undersized, over-competitive Ohio churches are securing for themselves every year by the process of consolidation. The educational program of the Ohio Council of Churches, the coöperative agency of sixteen Protestant denominations in the state, is lending impetus and guidance to the movement.

The local church merger process has been going on for nearly twenty years in Ohio, but it has accelerated noticeably in the past two or three years. As long ago as 1913, the Congregational and Disciple congregations at Aurora, Portage county, merged to form Ohio's first consolidated church of the "federated" type, in which each merging group retains its former denominational connections but both combine as a single congregation for all local purposes.

Not until after the Ohio Council of Churches began its work in 1920 did the church consolidation movement really get under way in Ohio. The first activity of the new council was to complete the rural church survey of the state, which had been launched by the ill-fated Interchurch World Movement. This revealed in county after county many instances of cut-throat competition among churches crowded into little communities, great areas entirely without resident pastoral leadership, other areas that were described as a veritable "no man's land of the churches," utter inadequacy of equipment and leadership in hundreds of small town and open country churches, vast numbers of adults and children in every county entirely without any contact with organized religion. Consolidation of churches in the overchurched fields, providing congregations strong enough to conduct really effective programs, and releasing pastors and home mission funds for use in really needy localities, was readily seen to be at least one answer to this situation.

The spread of good roads and the decrease of population in many rural areas, with resultant loss of members for local churches, tended to create an atmosphere favorable to consolidation. The example of the consolidated school, just then sweeping the state, also played its part by demonstrating the greater effectiveness of the larger unit.

As the Council of Churches has preached the gospel of consolidation constantly from pulpits and through the press and made it the topic of conference after conference of both clergy and laity, local church mergers have steadily increased in number. To-day the movement has more momentum than ever before. Two years ago there were fewer than 100 consolidated churches in the state. A tabulation in the early summer of 1931 shows 150 consolidated churches, with local merger projects under consideration in numerous other communities.

There are to-day fifty-three consolidated churches of the "federated" type, fifty-eight "denominational" consolidated churches, and thirty-one independent, non-denominational churches. Intra-denominational mergers of churches of the same denomination carry the total number of consolidations past 150.

Comparatively few non-denominational churches are being formed in recent years. Many of those listed are small congregations of no great strength or community leadership. On the other hand there are some of strength, such as the First Community church of Grandview Heights, Columbus suburb, originally a Congregational church, which dropped its denominational affiliations in 1918 and now has 1,400 members, representing twenty-six denominations. The non-denominational church seems to be better adapted to the city suburb, with a multiplicity of denominations present in the population, than to the ordinary town or country community.

In communities of the latter type, the "federated"

church, or the "denominational" type, in which one or more denominations withdraw and leave their members free to join the church that remains, is much more popular. Often the denominational type of consolidation is effected by an interdenominational "trade." For example, a few years ago the Methodists withdrew from Welshfield, leaving the Congregational church alone in the field, while the Congregationalists in the same manner yielded the nearby village of Nelson to the Methodists. In other cases, however, the withdrawal of one or more denominations is accomplished by a purely local agreement, as at Vermilion where the Methodist church abandoned the field and 118 Methodist members joined the Congregational church, which then called a Methodist pastor. At Greenwich the Congregational church withdrew and left the field to the Methodist congregation.

The merger of the Congregational and Christian churches on a state-wide and then on a national scale was preceded in Ohio by the consolidation of local churches of the two denominations in nearly every community where they are both present. There are four such local unions—at Lima, Springfield, Fort Recovery and Columbus.

Congregational or Christian groups, or both, are involved in twenty-three of the fifty-three federated churches in Ohio. They have a share in nineteen of the fifty-eight denominational community churches.

In the last two years the consolidation movement has developed a new phase by spreading from the small towns and rural districts into the cities. A Methodist and a Presbyterian congregation have merged in Cincinnati, Presbyterian and United Presbyterian in Toledo, Presbyterian and Reformed at Barberton (adjacent to Akron), Christan and Congregational (previously mentioned) in Columbus, Lima and Springfield, and practically every city has instances of mergers effected within single denominations. These intra-denominational mergers have also been increasing at a notable

rate recently, although the experience of denominational executives is that it is no easier to unite churches of the same denomination than those of different denominations.

In guiding all this development of the past ten years, the Ohio Council of Churches has applied no "high-pressure" methods. It never sends agents into a community to stir up interest in a specific local consolidation project. By agreement among the denominational executives of the state, meeting in an annual "comity conference," it leaves the launching of every consolidation project to local initiative. When two or more churches have officially signified a desire to unite and have appointed conference committees, then the representative of the Council is at their disposal as a source of advice and information, and the interested denominational executives are also called into consultation. In addition to meeting such calls for counsel, the Council of Churches continuously keeps the news of consolidation projects and successful consolidated churches before the church constituency, and makes this a central feature of its educational program. Incidentally, it finds that this consolidation movement has greater "selling value" than any other single feature of its extensive co-operative program (embracing evangelism, social service, international good-will, women's work and many other items) in winning the financial support and personal interest of laymen of all denominations.

Old prejudices have not entirely died out. Personal jealousies and deep-seated loyalties still prove to be stumbling-blocks to many consolidation projects. But the total experience of the Ohio Council of Churches leaves no room for doubt that a vast number of thoughtful church workers — laymen, pastors and denominational officials—are ready to move forward in a comprehensive program of local church consolidation.

Fewer and better churches is a widely accepted slogan of Ohio Protestants in this year, 1931.

[From Vinton E. McVicker in *The Congregationalist,* Boston.]

Reunion Via "Catholicity"

Reunion—in the sense of mutual "recognition" and intercommunion — has been achieved as between the church of England and the Old Catholics whose center is the see of Utrecht. The commission which met at Bonn in July has issued its report, and all that remains is for the respective convocations and synods of the two churches to ratify the terms of agreement. The findings of the Bonn Conference are as follows:

1. Each communion recognizes the catholicity and independence of the other and maintains its own.
2. Each communion agrees to admit members of the other communion to participate in the sacraments.
3. Intercommunion does not require from either communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion, or liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian faith.

One of the Anglican delegation, Canon G. F. Graham-Brown, principal of Wycliffe Hall, is a leading evangelical, and he has deemed it advisable to make a written statement justifying his concurrence in these findings. Reunion, he declares, cannot be brought about on the basis of identity of doctrine without a change of doctrine by one or other of the churches. Evangelicals, however, may be prepared to agree that there is nothing in the declaration of Utrecht (the doctrinal basis of the Old Catholic church) which need be an impediment to intercommunion. He is willing to concede intercommunion on the principle of the apostolic greeting: "Peace be with all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in uncorruptness." Free church evangelicals will say Amen very heartily to that; but they cannot fail to note that the basis of the Bonn agreement is a mutual recognition of "catholicity"—implying, presumably, episcopacy and the apostolic succession—and they are bound to recognize that such agreements must tend to retard

rather than to hasten unity as between the church of England and the "non-catholic" Free churches.

[From *The Christian World,* London.]

"We Will Not Pray With You"

Cardinal Bourne's secretary, Monsignor Coote, has replied to Sir Henry Lunn with reference to Sir Henry's use of the word "bigotry" as applied to the Roman Catholics' refusal to join in public prayer with Protestants. Msgr. Coote first refutes Sir Henry's suggestion that Cardinal Bourne takes a line which other Catholics —*e.g.*, Cardinal Manning—would have repudiated. He proceeds to define the Catholic position in the matter:—

"The position of the Nonconformist or Anglican, being wholly based on private judgment without a sure guiding authority, quite logically permits both to worship side by side as they may wish, although they may agree only partially in what they believe. The Catholic position, however, is based on authority. Catholics believe in one body of doctrine as revealed, and because revealed, by Christ to his church. They believe that body of doctrine to be the one, true and only faith, and they will not, and may not, join in any public prayers or worship with others who do not accept that body of doctrine in its entirety. Such principles may not be set aside for any social or sentimental considerations."

Msgr. Coote again protests that "bigotry" in this connection is "a grave misuse of terms, discourteous and offensive in its import." If it is offensive to apply the word "bigotry" to Roman Catholic individuals, compelled to administer the unchanging law of their church, no such consideration operates to prevent Protestants from declaring that the law itself is the very essence of bigotry, if that word has any meaning at all.

[From *The Christian World,* London.]

Reformed Fundamentalists and Unity

The difficulties of "church unity" are illustrated by the refusal of the 125th synod of the Reformed church in America to empower a committee to confer with the Presbyterian church on merger. The Reformed church was once the established church of Holland and the Presbyterian church was once the established church of Scotland. Both societies accepted Calvinism and rejected bishops. There was no difference other than geographical and to-day they occupy the same territory in America. The geographical difference has come to an end and they are now identical and duplicate sects. Yet they cannot unite. Why is this? Have new differences arisen? It was the Western and Fundamentalist vote in the synod which seems to have defeated the motion looking toward unity. The movement of Dr. Machen, who founded the Westminster Seminary at Philadelphia; the Fundamentalists, who form a strong party in almost every Protestant denomination; the great, obscure, unreasonable school of Karl Barth in Central Europe; these show us that Puritanism is neither dead, nor yet has it all turned Liberal. There still flourishes a kind of orthodox Puritanism in strife and feud with the very evident Liberal Puritanism. This new and real distinction is going to thwart "church unity" and to keep all the sects apart from each other.

[From *The American Church Monthly*, New York.]

The Need of Christian Unity Prophets

As I see it, the greatest need at this hour is prophets of Christian unity; men who are committed to unity wholeheartedly and absolutely; men who will apply to the unity task the superb witness of the greatest of the apostles whose watchword was, "this one thing I do"; men who will possess the passionate attitude toward

unity of William Lloyd Garrison toward the freedom of the slave, but without his bitterness when he said, "I will not equivocate, and I will be heard"; men who will take a strong position for Christian unity as did Luther at Worms for his Protestant conviction when he affirmed, "here I stand, God helping me, I can do none otherwise"; men who by their deeds will paraphrase Patrick Henry's famous words and exclaim, "Give me unity or give me neither peace of mind nor rest of spirit"; men who will bring to Christian unity the fervor that Henry Martyn brought to the missionary field, and pray, "Let me burn out for Christian unity"; men and women on fire with such a passion as might well find comradeship with Nathan Hale, martyr to the cause of political freedom, and after the manner of his farewell words, say: "My only regret is that I have but one life to give for Christian unity"; men who will have the courage "to renounce a proud inheritance, deny a passionate preference, and conquer a deep-rooted prejudice for the sake of unity."

With such prophets musing among us, the fire will burn. Only by such high devotion can we hope to escape the devastating blight of denominationalism and be saved from spiritual death in the swollen sea of pride and floodtide of worldly success.

[From Dr. Edgar DeWitt Jones, Detroit, Michigan.]

Protestants, Catholics, and Jews to Gather at Washington in 1932

A national Conference of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews will convene in the Hotel Willard, Washington, February 2 and 3, 1932, according to an announcement by Everett R. Clinchy who is directing a program of regional meetings of the "seminar-type" under the organization headed by the Hon. Newton D. Baker,

Prof. Carlton J. H. Hayes, and Roger W. Straus. This United States seminar to which people from all parts of the country are invited will have as its general subject "Religious Freedom and Mutual Understanding." February, 1932, will bring the bi-centennial celebration of George Washington's birthday, and also, co-incidentally, this conference of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews will open in Washington on the day that the Disarmament Conference expects to meet in Geneva.

Prominent speakers will address the general sessions. A large part of the time, however, will be given to discussion groups in which people of these three faiths will meet at round-tables to converse about strains and conflicts in their community situations. One session of the Washington Conference will bring together experts in the social sciences to analyze origins of prejudices, and the processes by which anti-social attitudes are changed. Specific enterprises upon which Protestants, Catholics, and Jews can coöperate in community and world situations will be dealt with.

"The National Conference of Jews and Christians," according to Newton D. Baker, "associates a number of thoughtful and earnest people in an effort to analyze and allay the prejudices which exist between Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. The conference seeks to moderate and finally to eliminate a system of prejudices which we have in part inherited." Applications for attendance cards and other inquiries may be addressed to the National Conference of Jews and Christians, 289 Fourth avenue, New York City.

[From *The Living Church,* Milwaukee, Wisconsin.]

BOOK REVIEWS

THE HISTORY OF FUNDAMENTALISM. By Stewart G. Cole, Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc.; 360 pages; price $2.50.

Among the changes in American Protestantism none is more marked than the conflict between fundamentalism and liberalism, the former holding to the older order of things and the latter adjusting itself to the needs of the times in the light of new knowledge. The antecedents of this controversy, its development, and its inevitable conflict are presented with a clarity that lights up the whole field in five of the major denominations and in several extra-denominational agencies. The denominations are the Baptists, Presbyterians, Disciples, Methodists, and Episcopalians, and among the extra-denominational agencies are prophetic conferences, the Christian Fundamentals League, publication of reactionary literature, the Association of Conservative Evangelical Colleges, the League of Evangelical Students, the Anti-evolution League of America, the Bryan Bible League, and so forth.

While every evangelical denomination in America has been involved, not in identical problems, but the social attitudes were the same. The conservatives sought to perpetuate the distinctive tenets of their denominational origins and resisted any change in ritual, creed, or polity with an uncomprising and reformative manner. While the other denominations are growing away from this condition, Dr. Cole says, "the Diciples' denomination is more seriously divided than is any other evangelical people in America," but "each [Disciple] group is strongly attached to the basic aim of their historic plea. That is, they both desire passionately the unity of Christendom."

This revival of modern orthodoxy, based upon the desire of conformity with the historic ideals that once actuated the denominations, will continue to make a struggle for its right of way, whatever may be the denomination, is really opposed to Christian unity ideals except in terms of submission. The liberal interpretation retains all of the primary value and relegates to a secondary place those values in the denominations that have perpetuated division.

The struggle has been real whether in the denominations or among the seventeen extra-denominational agencies. It is an educational task. Says Dr. Cole, "Leaders must bring their people abreast of the problems and ideals that characterize the age. The obligation can be borne only in so far as men understand intimately the quality of maladjustments that recent history has bequeathed them." While the churches have not recovered either spiritual poise or clarity of vision in consequence of the controversy they will find better understanding in "facing fearlessly the social conditions of faith and sharing mutually their values in the divine adventure." The gathering of data and the fair presentation of the controversy gives this book a high place in any study of trends in American Christianity. His concluding sentence is "Christianity will reassert its power in the humanity-distraught world as men nurture the fine sense of religious loyalty that inspired conservatives, as men pioneer with strong heart the unbeaten highways of truth which liberals seek, and as they wed this fervor and discipline into the harmony of christlike leadership."

THE WORLD'S MIRACLE AND OTHER OBSERVATIONS. By Karl Reiland, Rector of St. George's church, New York: Henry Holt and Company; pages 193; price $1.75.

Dr. Robert Norwood, who writes the foreword of this book, calls these one hundred chapters "prose-sonnets." Each covers one to two pages. They are the editorials from the Bulletin of St. George's church. Dr. Reiland reveals his wide range in thinking in the variety of topics, such as "The Angel and the Dog," "The Spider and the Silk," "Legacies and Lights," "The Boat Load of Salt Fish," "Brothers and Bricks," "The Two-cent Man," "The Stable and the Star," and so forth. The world's mircle is that, in spite of all adverse circumstances against Jesus, his divine presence has not been overwhelmed and lost. Every chapter makes good reading, backed by a philosophy that is appealing and an enthusiasm that is satisfying. In the chapter on "The Challenge of Jesus" he says, "The various communions, for instance, to say nothing of other religions, still have their fences about them. If they are no longer solid walls, they are at least barbed-wire entanglements; and though it is possible, as it was not heretofore, to see through, it seems still impossible for any to be consecrated enough to remove the barriers and exchange confidences. There may no longer be open enmity but there

is certainly no evidence of frank amity. No sensible man can see any reasons, divine or human, for the modern separatism which is the curse of Christian organization. Someone characterized a speech once as 'supernaturally stupid' and when asked what he meant by the phrase 'supernaturally stupid' replied that no one could possibly have delivered such a stupid speech without divine assistance; and perhaps no one can approve of the continuance of denominational exclusiveness except upon some such supposition. It is too stupid to be human any longer." Dr. Reiland is one of the foremost preachers in New York City and this book reveals the charm of his pulpit ministrations.

THE UNIQUE ALOOFNESS OF JESUS. By Jacob Bos. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc.; pages 235; price $2.00.

Recognizing that there is some distance between Jesus and Christianity, the author attempts to show the Godlike aloofness of Jesus by a brief ministry of miracles and mercy associated with a message that challenged men to forsake all others to follow him, seeing in him one infinitely superior to the Jesus of modern scientific criticism and likewise the Christ of Christian creeds. It is a timely call. It is so difficult to get back to the simplicity of the New Testament without going back by medieval pathways and gathering up the rubbish of the centuries and associating these things as part of the life of Jesus, when as a matter of fact these were the very things which he denounced. The author argues that the finality of the Christian religion is a church myth, that Christianity is only a civilization that must pass away as other civilizations have passed, but that Jesus is an eternal truth, that Calvary, the central fact of his life and work, demands that men always and forever take tremendously serious the life he came to establish. That life makes no compromises. It does not seek the convenience of time nor circumstances. Its grace, mercy, and truth are verities not to be reinterpreted and evaluated to fit the standards of any civilization or institution. Mr. Bos rightly regards much of Christianity as entirely beside the point of the purpose of Jesus in the world. Books of this type will multiply as men see the folly of our Christian civilization and this book will be read with interest by those who are dissatisfied with the present Christian conditions and feel in themselves the possibilities of a better civilization.

EVANGELICAL OFFICES OF WORSHIP AND MEDITATION. Derived chiefly from the New Testament. Compiled and Edited by William Norman Guthrie, Rector St. Mark's-in-the-Bouwerie, New York: The Schulte Press, 80 Fourth ave.; pages 289; price $2.00.

This book takes us into the field of dramatics, being twenty-five dramatic religious services used by Dr. Guthrie in his church work. Much publicity has been given them through the press and to read them in the quiet gives one a sense of the devotional element in them. It is an experiment to meet the changing times by combining the esthetic qualities of drama and poetry to the religious content of the Old and New Testament. The morality plays of the medieval period served a good purpose in the religious life of the communities. The purpose of these dramatics is to make more vivid the great ideals of spiritual life and to lead people into the reality of spiritual things. The services are full of beauty and indicate painstaking care and a healthy devotion.

A BOOK OF PRAYERS FOR STUDENTS. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc.; pages 199; price $1.25.

Over 30,000 copies of this book have already been sold in England. It contains short services for each day in the week, litanies and meditations, general prayers, collects and short prayers, and acts of devotion in preparation for holy communion. The prayers are selected from wide sources and are very helpful. It is a good size to put in one's pocket or suitcase when going on a trip. The prayers may be read and reread with great profit.

THE BAHA'I WORLD. A Biennial International Record. Prepared under the Supervision of the National Spiritual Assembly of the Baha'is of the United States and Canada with the approval of Shoghi Effendi. Volume III. New York: Baha'i Publishing Committee, P. O. Box 348, Grand Central Station; pages 376.

This interesting book, fully illustrated, was prepared under the personal supervision of the head of the Baha'i cause, who is a scholar of both Persian and English, having attended Oxford University. It gives valuable information regarding world peace and moral regeneration as emphasized by the Baha'i cause and will prove interesting to every student of this movement.

PRINTED IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE
HESS PRINTING COMPANY
BALTIMORE, MD.

The Equality of all Christians Before God

This is a full report of the New York Conference of the Christian Unity League, held at St. George's Protestant Episcopal church, Nov. 13-15, 1929.

This Conference marked the turning of a decisive corner in the advance toward a united church. Every one who is interested at all in Christian unity will want to read this volume. Every page abounds in interest.

Here is a part of the program: "Prayer as a Factor in the Unity of the Church," by Dr. Peter Ainslie, Baltimore. Greetings by Dr. Karl Reiland, rector of St. George's church. "The Need of a United Christendom," by Mr. Robert Fulton Cutting, vestryman of St. George's church. "What a United Church Can Do That a Divided Church Cannot Do," by Dr. W. Beatty Jennings, Philadelphia. "How Much Christian Unity Do We Now Have?" by Dr. Beverley D. Tucker, Jr., Richmond, Va. "Recent Evidences of Growth Toward Christian Unity," by Dr. J. W. Woodside, Ottawa, Canada. "The End of a Cycle in Protestantism," by Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, Chicago. "A Survey of the Day's Thinking," by Dr. Robert Norwood, New York. "Possibilities of Attaining Christian Unity," by President Daniel L. Marsh, Boston. "What Would Be the Attitude of Jesus Toward a Divided Church?" by Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, New York. "Shall We Continue Our Emphases on Orthodoxy and Conformity Rather Than on Purposes and Objectives?" by President George W. Richards, Lancaster, Pa. "Our obligation to the Future to Hasten a United Christendom," by Dr. W. H. P. Fauce, Providence, R. I. "The Call of the Future for a United Church," by Mr. Stanley High, Editor *The Christian Herald*, New York. Discussion follows each of these addresses.

The dramatic moving of the Lord's supper from St. George's church to the chapel of Union Theological Seminary, with Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin as celebrant, assisted by Dr. Karl Reiland, Dr. Robert Norwood, and Dr. Wallace MacMullen, was one of the significant events that indicates we have come to the time when brotherhood has priority over conformity to ecclesiastical practices.

This is one of the great books of the year.

Price $1.00; paper cover 75 cents

Address

THE CHRISTIAN UNITY LEAGUE

230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md.

CLEVELAND CONFERENCE NUMBER

VOL. XXI No. 3

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

JANUARY 1932

ONE OF THE EARLIEST CHRISTIAN GEMS

CONTENTS

Cleveland Conference

Celebration of the Lord's Supper . . . . S. D. CHOWN

Report of the Commission on the United Church of Canada

Report of the Commission on the United Church of the United States

Report of the Commission on Unity Movements in Politics, Science, and Industry, and their Influence on Unity Among Christians

Report of the Commission on Christianity and World Religion

Report of the Commission on the Message of the Conference

The Price to be Paid to Ensure Christian Unity . JOHN R. MOTT

At the Editor's Desk

Church Unity Through Christian Education . ALFRED NEVIN SAYRES

The Jews and Christians . . . . . HERBERT L. WILLETT

Book Reviews

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Inc.

W. H. HOOVER, President

BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

AGENTS:

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York

Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka, and Sendai

$2.00 a year 50 cents a copy

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Savior—are parts of the Church of Christ and the recognition of their Equality before God is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and equally free to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ—growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in His own words,—"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another."

CONTENTS

JANUARY, 1932

VOL. XXI. No. 3.

THE CLEVELAND CONFERENCE

The Celebration of the Lord's Supper—S. D. CHOWN 199

Report of the Commission on the United Church of Canada 201

Report of the Commission on the United Church of the United States 209

Report of the Commission on Unity Movements in Politics, Science, and Industry, and their Influence on Unity Among Christians 217

Report of the Commission on Christianity and World Religion 229

Report of the Commission on the Message of the Conference 235

The Price to be Paid to Ensure Christian Unity—JOHN R. MOTT 238

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK 246

CHURCH UNITY THROUGH CHRISTIAN EDUCATION—ALFRED NEVIN SAYRES 250

THE JEWS AND CHRISTIANS—HERBERT L. WILLETT 256

BOOK REVIEWS 279

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

Ten Hills, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in January, April, July, and October, is fifty cents a single copy, or two dollars a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion or individual contributing annually $5.00 or more to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY EXTENSION FUND will be entitled to receive three copies of THE QUARTERLY free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copies to some designated persons or institutions.

Entered as second-class matter October 18th, 1923, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A., under the Act of Congress of March 3rd, 1879.

The Christian Union Quarterly

EDITOR

PETER AINSLIE, D.D., Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, JR., D. D., Rector St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

DR. HAMILCAR ALIVISATOS,
Athens, Greece.

REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAN CHARLES R. BROWN,
New Haven, Conn.

PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
New York, N.Y.

REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.

PROF. DR. J. EUGENE CHOISY,
Geneva, Switzerland.

REV. S. D. CHOWN, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada.

DR. J. A. CRAMER,
Utrecht, Holland.

PROF. DR. ADOLF DEISSMANN,
Berlin, Germany.

REV. A. W. FORTUNE, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky.

DR. W. E. GARRISON,
Chicago, Ill.

PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE,
London, England.

MOST REV. METROPOLITAN GERMANOS,
Thyatira, Asia Minor.

PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER,
Elon College, N. C.

DR. HENRY T. HODGKIN,
Wallingford, Pa.

REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAN W. R. INGE,
London, England.

PROF. RUFUS M. JONES,
Haverford, Pa.

DR. ADOLPH KELLER
Geneva, Switzerland

BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL,
New York, N. Y.

BISHOP WILLIAM F. MCDOWELL,
Washington, D.C.

REV. JOHN HOWARD MELISH
Brooklyn, N. Y.

REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

DR. WILFRED MONOD,
Paris, France.

DR. C. C. MORRISON,
Chicago, Ill.

DR. JOHN R. MOTT,
New York, N.Y.

BISHOP HARALD OSTENFELD,
Copenhagen, Denmark.

BISHOP EDWARD L. PARSONS,
San Francisco, Calif.

PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS,
Lancaster, Pa.

PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE,
Oxford, England.

PASTOR DR. FRIEDRICH SIEGMUND-SCHULTZE,
Berlin, Germany.

DR. ROBERT E. SPEER,
New York, N.Y.

DR. HENRY VAN DYKE,
Princeton, N. J.

REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich.

BISHOP BOYD VINCENT,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK,
York, England.

The

CLEVELAND CONFERENCE

Being the Fourth Conference of the

CHRISTIAN UNITY LEAGUE

CHURCH OF THE COVENANT

EUCLID AVENUE *at* CORNELL ROAD

CLEVELAND, OHIO

NOVEMBER 17-19, 1931

A fellowship of adventurous Christians from nearly every communion in America seeking a parctical expression of equality before God in order to raise the standard of Christian brotherhood above every denominational barrier and to win others into the brotherhood of Jesus.

One is your teacher and you are all brothers—*Jesus*

The Pact of Reconciliation

We, Christians of various churches, believing that only in a coöperative and united Christendom can the world be Christianized, deplore a divided Christendom as being opposed to the spirit of Christ and the needs of the world. We, therefore, desire to express our sympathetic interest in and prayerful attitude toward all conferences, small and large, that are looking toward reconciliation of the divided church of Christ.

We acknowledge the equality of all Christians before God and propose to follow this principle, as far as possible, in all our spiritual fellowships. We will strive to bring the laws and practices of our several communions into conformity with this principle, so that no Christian shall be denied membership in any of our churches, nor the privilege of participation in the observance of the Lord's supper, and that no Christian minister shall be denied the freedom of our pulpits by reason of differences in forms of ordination.

We pledge, irrespective of denominational barriers, to be brethren one to another in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Savior, whose we are and whom we serve.

FOREWORD

THE Cleveland Conference was the fourth conference of the Christian Unity League. The first conference was held at the First Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, January 12 and 13, 1928, after two informal meetings, one at the Emmanuel Protestant Episcopal Church and the other at the First Presbyterian Church. There were 650 persons enrolled for the day sessions and there was a double attendance in the evenings. Persons came from eleven states and Canada. These were from twenty-five denominations, including Baptists, Catholics, Congregationalists, Christians, Disciples, Episcopalians, Evangelicals, Friends, Lutherans, Methodists, Reformed, Presbyterians, United Brethren, Universalists, Unitarians, and others.

The program covered the general field of Christian unity. There were special addresses on the Federal Council, the Stockholm Conference of 1925, and the Lausanne Conference of 1927, also addresses on unity in worship, in education, in the mission field, in social activities, and our next steps toward unity. Preceding the celebration of the Lord's supper was an address on the sacrament of unity, over which meeting a member of the Society of Friends presided. The celebration of the Lord's supper immediately followed, the celebrants representing several denominations. The bread and wine were distributed through the congregation by laymen from the following churches —Baptist, Congregational, Disciple, Episcopal, Evangelical, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian, Reformed, and Universalist.

The second conference was held at the Linwood Church, Kansas City, January 16 and 17, 1929. A severe storm interfered with attendance, but persons from twelve denominations registered, coming from five states. The Lord's supper was celebrated at the close of the conference with all the denominations of the city sharing in the celebration.

The third conference was held at St. George's Protestant Episcopal Church, November 13-15, 1929, which church was *loaned* to the League by the rector and vestry for a conference of three days. This conference drew persons from as far east as Maine, as far south as North Carolina, as far west as Missouri, and as far north as Canada. It was a notable gathering. The subjects discussed were, "The Need of a United Christendom," "What a United Church Can Do that a Divided Church Cannot Do," "How Much Christian Unity Do We Now Have?" "Recent Evidences of Growth Toward

Christian Unity," "The End of a Cycle in Protestantism," "The Possibilities of Attaining Christian Unity," "The Attitude of Jesus Toward a Divided Church," "Shall we Continue our Emphasis on Orthodoxy and Conformity Rather Than on Purposes and Objectives?" "Our Obligation to the Future to Hasten a United Christendom," and "The Call of the Future for a United Church." These are great themes and they were discussed with ability and frankness. (Persons who desire to have these addresses may secure them in a handsome volume without cost other than ten cents for postage by writing to the Christian Unity League, 230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore.) The celebration of the Lord's supper was removed from St. George's Church at the instance of the Protestant Episcopal bishop of the New York diocese. On the invitation of the president of Union Theological Seminary it was celebrated in the chapel of the Seminary with a Presbyterian as the chief celebrant and two Protestant Episcopal rectors and a Methodist minister as assistants, as originally planned.

The Cleveland Conference takes its place with the best of these conferences. Most of the members of the conference were from Ohio, but registrations included persons from eleven states and Canada—as far east as Massachusetts, as far south as Virginia, as far west as Missouri, and as far north as Canada. Twenty-four denominational groups were represented, including the leading Protestant denominations. There were also Catholics, Unitarians, and African Methodist Episcopalians. The conference began with the celebration of the Lord's supper and was followed by a program of reports of commissions—five groups of foremost Christians submitted for discussion carefully prepared reports that had largely come out of their group conferences. The evening addresses were of a high character. The conference made a definite register of advanced thinking. Dr. Chown, of Toronto, has written the account of the celebration of the Lord's supper. The reports of the commission are published in their revised form. We are glad to have the challenging address on "The Price to be Paid to Ensure Christian Unity," by Dr. John R. Mott, which marked the close of the conference. A prayer service was held in the afternoon preceding the conference. In all the conferences of the Christian Unity League it is customary to spend some time in prayer at the beginning of the conference. The pact of reconciliation, which is the charter of the League, is found on the opposite page and the free and unafraid are asked to sign it. The next conference will meet in St. Louis, May 3-5, 1932, and other conferences will be held this year in Minneapolis, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Albuquerque. To the inquiry as to how this work is supported, the answer is by voluntary contributions.

THE CELEBRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER AT THE CLEVELAND CONFERENCE

By Rev. S. D. Chown
Toronto, Canada

At each conference of the Christian Unity League the communion of the Lord's supper is celebrated, not only as an occasion of unfettered interdenominational fellowship, but as manifesting from time to time the growth of that virtue among the professed disciples of Christ. The increase of the spirit of equality before God is emphasized in the contrast between the circumstances of the communion service of the League two years ago, and that held during the recent conference in Cleveland, Ohio.

On the former occasion a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church felt it to be his duty to admonish the rector and official members of a congregation in his diocese not to permit the celebration of the sacrament within the *loaned* edifice under their care, this action being taken ostensibly because the minister who was to be the chief celebrant was lacking in "valid episcopal ordination," though withal he was in conspicuous and well deserved standing in the Presbyterian Church.

It will be recalled that, bowing to the decision of the bishop, the place of celebration was at once changed, but notwithstanding the disappointment, a large number of communicants representing many communions assembled in the chapel of Union Theological Seminary in New York and carried out their good purpose. Holy communion was celebrated there by a Presbyterian minister, two Protestant Episcopal rectors, and a Methodist minister. This conjunction of the clergy was regarded at that time as the gracious dawning of a new day in the Church of Christ in America. It was a moment of extraordinary spiritual exaltation, notwithstanding that the atmosphere was impregnated by the supposed possibility of unpleasant consequences to the clergy of the good bishop's communion. This feature of the service was epitomized and emphasized by the recessional hymn:

"Through the night of doubt and sorrow
Onward goes the pilgrim band;
Singing songs of expectation
Marching to the promised land.

Clear before us through the darkness
Gleams and burns the guiding light;

Brother clasps the hand of brother
Stepping fearless through the night.

One the object of their journey,
One the faith that never tires,
One the earnest looking forward
One the faith which God inspires."

What a change! During the last conference of the Christian Unity League the communion of the Lord's supper was celebrated as usual, but in a distinctly different atmosphere. The bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, within whose diocese it was held, entered the church with the procession. He took his place behind the altar and offered a special invocation of great beauty, appropriateness and power. He also partook of the sacrificial elements at the hands of a Lutheran minister and a Methodist minister. In this way the bishop bore testimony to his belief in the equality of all sincere Christians before God and showed his respect for the great and pervasive work of the Christian Unity League.

In the clergy stalls were seated the Right Rev. Warren L. Rogers, D.D., bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, diocese of Ohio; Rev. Harold C. Phillips, D.D., minister of the First Baptist Church, Cleveland; Rev. Philip Smead Bird, D.D., minister of the Church of the Covenant (Presbyterian), Cleveland; Rev. Raymond C. Burns, assistant to Dr. Phillips and Rev. Victor Obenhaus, assistant to Dr. Bird. The Rev. J. H. L. Trout, Lutheran, and the Rev. M. M. Brown, Methodist, served the occupants of the clergy and choir stalls. The congregation was served by ministers of various communions, including two Congregationalists, two Disciples, two Baptists, three Presbyterians, one United Presbyterian, two Evangelicals, two Methodists, and one Evangelical Synod. These ministers moved with noiseless precision, quickening that sense of spiritual sublimity which should be germane to the most solemn function of the Church of Christ.

The manifest presence of the Holy Spirit, the perfect sense of fellowship, and the evidence of personal consecration sublimated this human mechanism and clothed it with memorable impressiveness. The Rev. Dr. Bird, minister of the church, deserves more than any one other person the thanks of all well wishers of the Christian Unity League for his apparently perfect arrangements. The sympathetic cadence and articulation of the marvelously clear voiced choir of the church also deepened the spiritual significance of the whole service.

The Christian Unity League is evidently achieving its splendid ideal. The time appears to be swiftly approaching when it shall no longer be regarded as a marvel, but simply as a cause of rejoicing that the rich and full "communion of the saints" has superseded the painful divisions of the present, and Jesus will be accepted as the one teacher and all his disciples as in reality brothers. Surely the unification of the world in many departments of cosmic activity at the present time shall press forward the unity of Christendom in religious life, and hasten the answer to the prayer of Jesus that "they all may be one," that the world may know that he was sent of God.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA

As representing the United Church of Canada we have been asked to prepare a report setting forth the influences leading toward church union in Canada, the negotiations through which church union was consummated, the necessity of legal incorporation, and the tokens of divine guidance before, during, and since its consummation, with some evidences of its success.

I. The Influences Leading Toward Church Union

The most potent influence predisposing the Christian communions in Canada toward church union was a dominating purpose that the gospel should be preached and religious privileges afforded to each new settlement in the far-flung frontiers of the Dominion at the very beginning of its community existence. This purpose resulted in a greater concern for the upbuilding of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ than the development of any denomination. Dominating the religious life and outlook of the three communions which united in 1925 to form the United Church of Canada, this purpose had produced 19 church unions, involving 40 branches of their religious families, between the year 1817 and the early years of the present century. Within Presbyterianism the various bodies had organically united until in 1875 there were four constituent churches, which then united to form the Presbyterian Church in Canada. The union of the four Methodist bodies in 1884, forming the Methodist Church, had been preceded by several unions, inclusive of all the branches of that family. In 1906 the Congregational Churches of Canada were joined to form the Congregational union. It is evident that the desire for unity had become a habit in the mind of most Canadian people.

The initial action toward the church union in Canada which was consummated in June, 1925, was that of the Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, which in 1889 appointed a committee to confer with other denominations, with power to enter into any arrangements which would tend to bring about more satisfactory conditions in home mission work. The Methodist Church immediately responded, and in a short

time it was agreed that if either the Presbyterian or the Methodist Church was at work in any locality, the other would not enter into competition. That concession was shortly followed by an agreement to abolish competition in every frontier locality by withdrawing therefrom all missionaries except the representatives of one of the negotiating churches. Later it was arranged in respect to sparsely settled or unoccupied territory in so far as these two chief churches were concerned that the people living in communities along the Canadian Pacific railway would be left to the care of the Presbyterian Church, while those living contiguous to the Canadian National railway would be under the care of the Methodist Church. In addition to the local union congregations formed by that official action, a considerable number of such congregations were formed upon the initiative of the people themselves, without any stimulus from the church officials.

These methods, thus briefly outlined, resulted in about 1,200 charges, including more than 3,000 congregations, being locally unified, while hundreds of formerly dependent charges came to self-support through reorganization and additions to their membership. All these became congregations of the United Church on the consummation of union. Since that time the United Church has opened more than 300 new pastoral charges, with probably a full thousand preaching places, and nearly 500 new Sunday-schools. The new settlements on the prairies, in the mining camps, pulpwood towns, and among our fisherfolk, have been reached with the Gospel of Jesus in a way which the churches dis-united could never have equalled.

Coöperation in education and other church work was another important influence leading toward organic union. Wherever the negotiating churches were operating two or more theological seminaries their professorial staffs were utilized in coöperation. Their students used the same text-books, heard the same lectures, and were subject to the same examinations. The Sunday-school preiodicals of the three denominations were jointly prepared, published and circulated in all their schools. Social service work also was carried on under the same non-competitive principle.

Other influences leading toward church union may be mentioned, such as the ideal of brotherhood of love and fellowship postulated as a characteristic of the kingdom of God, and necessary for the manifestation of its unity; the injury inflicted upon Christianity by the stigma of its unhappy isolations; the manifest tendencies toward union observable in the Christian world at large; the enlightened patriotism which in Canada called for the Christianizing of an immense territory which was to be populated by millions of migrants of foreign birth and alien affiliations; the antipathy on the part of converts in foreign missions to receive the gospel from the hands of churches divided at home; the possibility of developing a larger type of Christianity among ourselves; the need of keeping faith with thousands of people who in local churches had severed themselves from their own denomi-

nations with the promise that they would be reunited in the larger fellowship, and the possibility of avoiding the waste of the Lord's men and money in unseemly rivalries.

II. The Negotiations of the Uniting Churches

Only an inadequate summary of the negotiations of the uniting churches can be given here. They are described fully in *The Story of Church Union in Canada,* published by the United Church Publishing House, Toronto, Canada.

An important event definitely related to the church union movement as such took place in 1902, when a fraternal deputation, representing the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, visited the General Conference of the Methodist Church. Its personnel consisted of Principal Patrick and Professor Bryce, of the Manitoba Theological College, and Rev. C. A. Gordon, D.D., familiarly known as "Ralph Connor." The most important utterance of this deputation was an invitation to the Methodist General Conference to appoint a committee to begin negotiations for organic union with the Presbyterian Church. The General Conference expressed its conviction that in its opinion the time was opportune for a definite movement concentrating attention on, and aiming at the organic union of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Congregational Churches of Canada, and the Methodist Church. It also resolved that it would regard with gratification a movement with this object in view, facilitate the formulation of a Basis of Union, and educate the people interested into that deeper spirit of unity and mutual concession on which the successful consummation of such movements ultimately depends. A committee on church union was appointed, "to confer with committees that may be appointed by such churches, and report to the next General Conference."

Each of the churches named appointed committees. The first meeting of the Joint Union Committee was held in Toronto, on April 21, 1904. It reached the unanimous conclusion, "that organic union is both desirable and practicable." It further commended the whole subject to the sympathetic and favorable consideration of the chief assemblies of the churches concerned for such further action as they might deem wise and expedient. It also declared that, "In the brotherly spirit of their deliberations, in the harmony of their decisions, in the solution of many difficulties presented to them, they recognized the guidance of the divine Spirit and were led to submit the results of their conference to the churches represented by them."

In 1905 a friendly letter was sent to the Church of England in Canada and the Baptist Churches in Canada, explaining the decisions already reached by the Joint Union Committee and extending cordial invitations to them to send delegates to participate in the further discussion of church union, should they consider it advisable to do so. These churches replied in courteous, fraternal terms, but did not appoint committees to participate in the negotiations.

The Joint Union Committee met year by year to consider the reports of its special Committees on Doctrine, Polity, the Ministry, Administration, and Law. In 1908 it agreed upon a Basis of Union. This was sent to the supreme courts of the three churches with the recommendation that they submit it to their lower courts and to the membership of their respective churches. The basis as then prepared was approved in general by the supreme courts in 1909, 1910, and 1911, and referred to their lower courts and the membership according to the constitutional procedure of each church.

The balloting in the Presbyterian Church showed a decided majority of every class of voters not only in favor of organic union, but of organic union upon the basis presented. This vote, taking place before the organization of active opposition to church union with all its appliances for dissuading officials and people from favoring the movement, more clearly represented the real feeling of the Presbyterian Church in Canada than any later decision could possibly do. Eleven of the twelve Conferences of Methodism approved, the vote standing 1,579 for and 270 against. The official boards and membership also voted their approval by large majorities. In the end not a single congregation dissented, while the General Conference voted unanimously in favor. As early as 1912 the Special Committee of the General Conference declared itself satisfied that the Methodist Church was now prepared to proceed toward the union heretofore agreed upon.

The ministers, officials, and members of the Congregational Church favored union by very large majorities. Over 95 per cent ultimately came into the United Church.

Within the Presbyterian Church the General Assembly, year after year, encouraged the freest discussion of every phase of the question of church union. The fullest liberty was accorded both supporters and opponents for the expression of their views. Every precaution was taken to prevent undue haste. Each step of advance taken was in perfect conformity with the principles of democracy. In the final decisive vote, in 1916, taken in Winnipeg, 406 commissioners voted for, and 90 against union.

III. The Creed

The United Church of Canada, prior to union, did what the Church of Scotland thought it necessary to do after union. It prepared a creed "free from subtlety of thought, easily apprehended by plain men and expressive of the deepest certainties of the Christian life." The creed adopted by the United Church was declared by a sturdy opponent of union to be a clear setting forth of the present substance of the Protestant faith in a full, simple, and scriptural manner. He asserted that it was a statement of permanent value to the Christian world.

The Statement of Doctrine, in twenty articles, sets forth the substance of the Christian faith as commonly held by the Presbyterian Church in

Canada, the Congregational Union and the Methodist Church. It asserts that "we build upon the foundation laid by the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone." It declares, "we affirm our belief in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the primary source and ultimate standard of Christian faith and life." It maintains allegiance to the evangelical doctrines of the Reformation as set forth in common in the doctrinal standards adopted by the three churches that were united. This statement of doctrine is positive, constructive, and workable. The experience of six years has proven it to be wholly acceptable to our own ministers and people. During those years this statement has received the approval of an ever widening circle of Christian people outside our own church and country.

IV. The Necessity of Legal Incorporation

The question is asked as to the necessity for the United Church of Canada seeking legal incorporation. This may be answered very briefly with the statement that the Methodist Church had considered it wise to procure incorporation for the purpose of holding its property and ensuring the legal conduct of its business. For the same reasons the Presbyterian Church in Canada and the Congregational Churches of Canada had found it necessary to incorporate certain boards and general committees of those churches. The Joint Committee on church union when considering this aspect of its negotiations concluded that it would be more satisfactory to secure the incorporation of the church as a body, thus giving it legal entity to the church, rather than to secure the incorporation of a number of boards and committees which might not always have unity of view in the administration of the affairs of the church.

V. Evidences of Success

Rev. George C. Pidgeon, M.A., D.D., the first Moderator of the United Church, has expressed his views by saying that, "We have entered into a far wider and richer fellowship. Men of the same faith now have intimate communion in the things of God. Previously we were together in the outward expressions of religion in social life. Now we are together in those acts of worship by which the presence of God is realized and the soul fed. When this was first brought about the joy that it inspired knew no bounds. We have made clear to all the world the possibility of a vital union between Christians of different traditions, different systems of doctrine and different forms of church government. These differences had long ceased to be vital and now we are united in the faith and principles which we always held in common. We have led the world in one step more toward the reunion of Christendom."

Rev. W. T. Gunn, M.A., D.D., was Moderator in 1930 and indicates his conception of providential leadership in the following words:

"The saving of the churches through coöperation is beyond estimation. In one district alone, that of New Ontario in the north, coöperation resulted in the saving of 80 men and $50,000 a year to the Methodist and Presbyterian Mission Boards; and still the work was better done. It is significant in this connection that after the formation of the United Church the demand for Community Churches ceased, the desire for local unity and simplicity of faith and breadth of fellowship apparently having found complete satisfaction in the United Church. Twenty-six Administrative Boards were combined in six, and our headquarters' staff with care and consideration for the men and interests involved has been reduced by about sixteen officers and many thousand dollars in expense. Our fifteen theological colleges have been combined in eight, each strategically located in connection with our provincial universities. Givings to the general work of the church have increased twenty per cent over the givings of the same people in the three churches prior to union."

He asked the question, "Do we really enjoy the new mixed fellowship?" and answered it as follows, "Beyond all our expectations. Twenty years ago the Joint Union Committee expected that it would take a generation for our people to love our new church as well as they loved the churches in which they had been born and brought up. To our happy surprise we found that we had been united before we had met. As one of our good Scottish university presidents stated, 'I have been looking for those "temperamental differences" and cannot find them. They are all just plain "bunk."' The fact is that visitors to our United Church meetings find that it is impossible to guess our former church affiliations either on the platform or in the pew, and we ourselves have ceased to pay much attention to them.

"During all the twenty years of negotiations and during these first four years of the United Church of Canada there has never been one single vote divided upon the old denominational lines. At our last General Council there was such a general spirit of happy affection that man after man of the three former churches came to the Moderator saying that never in the former bodies had they experienced so united and affectionate a meeting. We were conscious that the love of God had been shed abroad in our hearts for one another and for our new church."

The present Moderator, Rev. E. H. Oliver, M.A., D.D., F.R.S.C., in a recent interview stated that the United Church is stronger in membership, more vigorous in missionary effort both at home and abroad, and less conscious of the different strands of tradition than at the time of union in 1925. "I have visited our church from coast to coast. I have seen it in action in pioneer settlement and frontier mission and stately city church. It has never been more magnificent than at this moment in vision and sympathy, in sacri-

ficial spirit and consciousness of unity." It looks as though a kingdom of God movement is at hand here as in the orient. The church is girding itself in its main business of making the Church of Jesus Christ supreme in life in all its relationships. It is ready to dedicate its resources of life and possessions to building up the kingdom, and to remind itself that the Cross is central to all Christian living and is the condition of all Christian discipleship.

The New York *Christian Advocate* recently printed the following reference to a comparative statistical exhibit published by the United Church, under the caption, "A Going Concern."

"A sheet of figures gives the statistical history of the United Church of Canada in terms that should hearten all friends of Christian union. Presbyterians, Methodists, and Congregationalists came under one rooftree in 1925. Then there were 600,522 members. Now there are 662,253, a gain in each year of union. The 369,562 families are now 417,815. Though there are fewer Sunday-schools, there are 56,000 more pupils and 64,000 more members in young people's societies. Though church property values have risen by $14,000,000, the debt is up only $1,700,000. Pastors' salaries show a gain of $500,000 despite the depression, which has reduced the total amount raised by the United Church from $16,968,243 in 1925-26, to $16,421,286 in the year ending December 31, 1930."

The way the United Church is influencing youth is expressed in an editorial from the *Record,* from which we quote:

"While the various groups for older boys and girls have drawn off the younger constituency, the older Young People's societies and groups of our church have begun to show growth in numbers, influence, and missionary activity. The 1930 statistical report of the Board of Religious Education shows a total membership of 78,735 in Young People's societies as over against 73,838 in 1929. The young people in the presbyteries are accepting the missionary challenge to special endeavor in a heartening way. In 1929 they raised $39,769.47 for Missionary and Maintenance Fund, including special objects of support. In 1930 they raised $46,534.01, an increase of $6,764.44. This progress in the Young People's work is most encouraging and is evidence of a vitality within the life of the church."

Running throughout the period of negotiation was a conviction that far more essential than unity itself were the strengthening of Christian character and the enrichment of the spiritual life of both ministers and people. It was realized that the new church would not be a downy bed of ease but a workshop of immense proportions and unmeasured tasks; that it would require a striking spiritual evolution breaking up the fountains of the great deep of our souls that God might have his own way completely with us. We felt that this new departure was calling us back to the first principles and practices of Christianity and a spirit of great renunciation must possess the

uniting churches if they fulfil the definite purpose in union. The martyr-like sacrifices made by many ministers have fulfilled that anticipation. In loyalty to their convictions they relinquished their ministry in non-concurring congregations; they left competence and comfort behind them and without stick or stone entered into church union.

S. D. Chown, *Chairman*
Toronto
Robert Baird, Winnipeg
Lloyd C. Douglass, Montreal
C. W. Gordon, Winnipeg
John MacKay, Winnipeg
T. Albert Moore, Toronto
E. H. Oliver, Saskatoon
George C. Pidgeon, Toronto
J. H. Riddell, Winnipeg
Richard Roberts, Toronto
W. H. Sedgewick, Toronto
J. M. Shaw, Kingston
James Smyth, Montreal
John W. Woodside, Ottawa

Editor's Note:—*The Story of Church Union in Canada* of which this report is an outline receives full and authoritative treatment in the book of that name written by Rev. S. D. Chown, D.D., LL.D., and published by the United Church Publishing House, 299 Queen St. West, Toronto, price 75 cents, paper cover.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE UNITED CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES

In presenting this report to the Cleveland Conference of the Christian Unity League, the men who have prepared it wish it clearly understood that they are acting in no official capacity as representatives of the various denominations, but that they are drawn together by a common interest in the theme of Christian unity. They have not undertaken to compare or formulate their convictions regarding the two important and as yet divisive themes of faith and orders. They are not necessarily of one mind regarding the nature of the unity toward whose attainment they feel a common urgency of effort. But they are deeply sensitive to the present distracted and inefficient condition of the Church of God, and are conscious that one of the chief causes of the present weakness and reproach under which the church rests is its lack of unity, and the consequent wastage of effort and resources from which it suffers.

A divided church has little time or wit to bestow upon the major evils of society when it is exhausting its vitality in providing for its own survival.

There are three attitudes which may be taken toward this theme of Christian unity. The first is one of hostility. It is conceivable that there are Christians who are definitely opposed to any change in the *status quo*. It is probable that in intelligent circles within the church their number is small. The second attitude is one of mild approval but of amiable indifference. Here stand the vast majority of church members at the present time. They believe that there should be a closer fellowship among Christians, and that at some future time this far off divine event will take place. But they are quite content with the present denominational order, and are disinclined to any effort to bring it to an end.

There is another company, too small as yet, but definitely committed to the conviction that Christian unity is the needed remedy for the manifest ills of the church and of human society, and pledged to some participation in the adventure of bringing it to pass. They believe that it is the next inevitable step in the preparation for the coming of the kingdom of God in sufficient power and fulness to realize the ideals of Jesus in the world. And they know that this is the only generation in which they are to have the divine opportunity to work at this or any other earthly task. They are not sure that they know the precise technique by which that unity is to be

realized. They have no blue-print of the church as it is to be. But they are very certain that such is the will of our Lord, and that in prayer, conference and insistent utterance of that message something always happens favorable to the consummation of this their hearts' desire.

I

Such earnest commitments to the need and the timeliness of effort in behalf of this impressive enterprise receive reinforcement from the advances already made among the American churches, and the projects now under consideration looking to this end. Devotion to the ideal of a united church was a prominent characteristic of Protestantism from its beginnings, and this motive has not been wholly obscure in any period of its history. The thought of union has, therefore, the background of continuous Protestant tradition. In essence Protestantism is not divisive but unitive. To the visible resources of our common Protestantism may well be added that conviction regarding the necessary and essential oneness of all believers which has never been absent from the Protestant movement since its inception, and which now under changed social and intellectual conditions has an opportunity for realization which has hitherto been denied it.

During the past twenty years greater progress has been attained in the direction of unity than in the entire previous history of the church. This progress has taken many forms, but the spirit has been the same. The old Evangelical Alliance gave place to the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Church unions of outstanding importance have been consummated. Ten Lutheran bodies have been consolidated in the United Lutheran church. The Congregational and the Christian churches have joined forces. Movements looking to the reunion of the Presbyterian churches are under way. The union of the Presbyterian and the Methodist bodies has been favorably considered. The Evangelical Synod of North America and the Reformed Church of America have revived their approaches toward the same objective.

Such attempts, whether or not consummated as yet, are signs of the times, and must be hailed with joy by all the children of God. Great encouragement has come to the friends of unity in the United States from the enterprises of similar character taking form elsewhere, such as the union of the Presbyterian churches in Scotland, the union of the Wesleyan bodies in England, the union of the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Methodist churches in Canada in the United Church of Canada, the rise of a United Evangelical church in the Philippines, and of the United Christian churches in China and India. Great gatherings of Christians of many communions have been held for conference, counsel and mutual understanding, such as the Edinburgh Missionary Conference in 1910, the two World Conferences on Faith and Order held at Geneva in 1920 and at Lausanne in 1927, the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work held at Stockholm in

1925, the Jerusalem Missionary Council in 1928, and the conference of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches in Prague in 1928. The ministries of all these assemblies have been perpetuated through continuation committees, which are the promise of still more notable and effective gatherings to be held in the future.

Meantime local Councils of Churches have taken form in fifty cities in the United States under the stimulus afforded by the Federal Council of Churches, and a dozen or more state councils are functioning serviceably. Similar local federations are taking form in Great Britain. These local councils carry on a wide variety of activities such as no single denomination could prosecute as efficiently. Particularly significant have been the activities of the committees on comity both in local areas and in the mission fields, and the closer relationship secured in the domain of religious education. The work of the Home Missions Council has been a notable example of coöperative effort in the United States. The Community Church movement has been an interesting feature of unified church work during the past few years. It now numbers more than two thousand congregations. Its leaders have recognized the two-fold danger of undirected isolation and of yielding to the tendency to become a new denomination, and are seeking to guard against both. Studies of community conditions are throwing light on the problem of church planting and support, and the perils of overlapping and overlooking, especially in rural and village communities. It is a further encouraging fact that several of the denominations have permanent committees or commissions on Christian unity, whose efforts are directed to the study of present conditions and the planning of such forms of coöperation and union as seem practicable.

II

At the New York Christian Unity Conference held in St. George's Protestant Episcopal Church, November 13-15, 1929, a report was presented which gave some outline of the progress of Christian unity up to that time, the urgent need of further action in the same direction, both at home and in the foreign field, the current dissatisfaction expressed in many areas at the inefficiency of the church's activities, and the sentiment that its divisions were the basic cause of much of this decline in practical results. At that time certain practical measures were proposed looking to greater demonstration of the actual unity of the church. The Conference recognized the fact that it was set neither for the unification of doctrine nor the settlement of the vexing problem of holy orders. Its task was much simpler and more immediate. It is precedent to the attainment of the ultimate pattern of Christian union, whatever that may prove to be.

It is in the same attitude of prayerful consideration of the steps which may be taken at the present time, and without commitment to any program of formal and incorporating union, however desirable that may prove to be,

that the present committee presents its report. We have the conviction that most of the items adopted by the former Conference have values which are not to be disregarded. How far those measures have been tried in the interval it is impossible to say. We should like to reaffirm some of them, and give them all possible emphasis as no mere counsels of perfection but methods of coöperation immediately practicable, and urgently needed at the present time.

Preceding every consideration is the unfailing recognition of the Saviorhood and Lordship of Jesus Christ, and constant remembrance of his intercessory prayer with its central petition for the unity of his followers, to which the following ten suggestions are supplementary.

1. The practice of prayer, fervent and unceasing for a united Christendom and the establishment of such attitudes as prayer generates toward all Christians everywhere.

2. Emphasis upon the unity of Christians in the work of religious education through every grade of the church schools. If special days are thought essential to the work of temperance and missionary education, ought there to be less attention to this profoundly important aspect of the Christian enterprise?

3. The discussion of Christian unity by ministers in sermons and addresses, by ministerial associations, councils of churches, denominational assemblies, regional and general, and by national conferences. The program committees of all such gatherings should feel themselves charged with responsibility for the inclusion of at least one session devoted to this theme in the schedule of their periodic gatherings.

4. The interchange of pulpits by ministers of different communions. Ministers of the gospel need to be shaken from the inertia which commits them to an undeviating adherence to the denominational routine in their pulpit ministries.

5. The encouragement, wherever practical and wise, of the interchange of ministers between communions. This custom is already common for other reasons. There should be added this deliberate effort to demonstrate the equality of all ministers within the measure of their abilities and their consecration.

6. The reception of members from one communion into another without prejudice or further church requirement.

7. The encouragement of the union of congregations of different communions in areas where the work of the kingdom can be done more effectively by one church than by two or more. This is already widely occurrent in the formation of community churches. It should also be promoted deliberately and courageously by denominational agencies.

8. The encouragement of the union of separate groups or divisions in the same denomination, where the causes of division have ceased to have significance. Instances of such efforts at union are now evident.

9. More definite attention on the part of ministers and other Christian scholars to the popular presentation to their people, in the public services, classes and lectures, of the Christian origins, creeds, ordinances, forms of worship, church organization and government, and especially the causes of denominational movements, in order to better understanding of the permanent and essential factors in our holy faith as contrasted with those which are temporal and variable. The interest and profit of such studies, and their value as aids in the promotion of the sentiment of Christian unity can hardly be overstated. The growing sensitiveness of the churches to the need of a more organic and visible union of Christians than has been in contemplation hitherto. The voices which are expressing the hope for such an issue of the unity sentiment among Christians are too numerous and too insistent to be ignored.

10. Reaffirmation wherever possible of the words and spirit of the Pact of Reconciliation, in the bonds of whose spirit and fellowship we are met, especially emphasizing open membership, open communion, open pulpits, and an attitude of Christian brotherhood toward all Christians as the immediate step in the pathway toward Christian unity. Until we have gotten to the place where we recognize the equality of all Christians before God in these practical expressions it will be difficult to speak in any practical way relative to Christian unity, unless we speak by the way of absorption. The Spirit of Christ must hold priority over all ecclesiastical traditions, all creeds, and all denominational practices. Jesus says, "One is your teacher and you are all brothers."

III

In addition to these somewhat obvious and familiar suggestions, we wish to present some items of more definite and concrete character.

1. *Denominational Colleges.* We believe that the denominational college, in the period now drawing to a close, has rendered a very real service in the history of American education. It has pioneered in the provision of opportunities for higher education all across the land and has enlisted the pride and loyalty of the churches in that great cause. But in these last years as denominational fences have broken down and tax supported higher education has vastly increased in amount and quality, these colleges have tended to become regional rather than denominational centers of educational loyalty, enlisting the support of the community with rapidly increasing disregard of sectarian lines. The older and better of them have drawn both their students and their support from much wider areas than was the case in their earlier years. We believe that this marked tendency is in the line of educational progress, and that the appeal for the support of higher education in a religious atmosphere should hereafter stress local and qualitative rather than denominational loyalties and motives.

2. *Religious Journalism.* This presents a problem of importance. The

Religious Press section of the Standard Rate and Data Service reports 460 such journals. This fact reflects to some degree the variety in theological conviction, religious outlook and denominational emphasis. Most of this journalism is in weak financial condition, and to a marked degree, of competitive character. Few religious papers are self supporting. Most of them are subsidized by private or denominational funds. They are the result of competitive denominational promotional programs. They are among the chief means of perpetuating the present sectarian status. A very large proportion of these denominational publications could be discontinued without loss to the interests of the kingdom of God. Many of them are kept alive by heroic and sacrificial effort which might well be directed to more serviceable ends. In the interest of unity the increasingly difficult situation confronting the denominational press is not to be deprecated. It is a sign of progress toward better patterns of church life. Those journals which survive might well discontinue all emphasis on narrow and exclusive denominational relationships as desirable and worthy. They could direct attention vigorously toward the larger relationships of all Christians, and thus promote a sense of wider fellowship and interdependence. This could be done through emphasis upon the general religious news of the world, and through a deliberate and sustained editorial policy, thus creating an atmosphere in which unity may grow. The survivors in this inevitable process of elimination will be the journals which most adequately interpret the ecumenical spirit of Christianity.

3. *Missions.* The problem of missionary expansion has vital relations to the interests of Christian unity. There is a growing sentiment of disapproval of the competitive and inevitably uneconomic duplication and overlapping of missionary effort in the non-Christian world. In spite of all efforts at comity, the impression made upon the churches and the outside world is one of denominational rivalries. Missionary boards are naturally eager for such results as justify the missionary effort and satisfy the supporters of the work. Has not the time arrived to demonstrate the essential unity of the churches at home by some form of united administration on the foreign field? The steps already taken in this direction have met with the warmest approval on the part of thoughtful Christians of all communions. It is believed that nothing would more definitely strengthen the morale of the home churches than the unification of denominational agencies in the missionary areas. An increasing company of Christians in the home lands, now viewing the work of missions with questioning minds and supporting it with diminishing resources, would welcome such unification as should remove the present reproach of rival and competing efforts. They would contribute generously to a common missionary fund where they have ceased to be concerned for the promotion of denominational boards. It is believed that the commission now visiting the mission fields for the purpose of survey and appraisal may be able to formulate new suggestions for missionary strategy which will include larger and satisfying emphasis on the unification of agencies and resources.

4. *Church Buildings and Debts.* In the expansion of denominational building programs the churches are laying a heavy burden of pride and expense upon individual congregations and entire denominations. Several of the communions have fallen into the spirit of imitation and competition in building elaborate and unnecessary ecclesiastical structures in the capital city of the land and other metropolitan centers. These are enterprises natural enough as examples of denominational zeal, but unhappy in their results. They perpetuate sectarian rivalries and differences on a still larger scale. Furthermore they hand on to another generation a hangover of debt which is likely to prove disastrous. There are many church structures recently reared or now in contemplation which are far beyond the economic ability of their people to finance or of the community to liquidate. It is no time to indulge in architectural excesses, however artistic, when every Christian agency is in urgent need of funds. This type of extravagance is quite alien to the mind of Christ and a hindrance to the progress of Christian reunion. If cathedrals are to be built they should represent the united interest of the community, as they did in the days of their rise, and not any one denomination. Then they would exhibit the total Christian spirit of a city, and any reasonable expense would be justified in expressing this spirit in beauty and with sacrifice.

5. *Denominational Student Centers.* We believe that similar questions may well be raised regarding the establishment of denominational student centers at state universities. The various communions make strenuous efforts to give to the students of their own faith and order buildings and programs of a distinctly denominational, not to say partisan, character. The clear duty of the churches is to show them that Christ's way of life is not exclusive but inclusive, and that the interests of the kingdom of God are best served in fellowship and not in separation. The project for schools of religion at institutions not provided with religious instruction, foundations in which the different religious bodies may coöperate and in which there may be a unified program of instruction, meets our hearty approval.

6. *Theological Education.* In the area of theological education great advances have been made of late in the direction of interdenominational and united effort. Few of the larger seminaries and divinity schools are denominational in any particularistic sense. They may be in their origin the contributions of some individual denomination to education, but hardly more. Their students and faculties represent many communions. It is felt increasingly that it is too late in the Christian era to erect institutions for ministerial and missionary training in isolation from the broadening influence of universities, or in separation from other Christian foundations of like character. This fact accounts for the gathering of seminaries about competent universities, and for the creation of schools of religion of graduate order in which, with diversity of disciplines and points of view, there may be unity of purpose and spirit.

7. Research and Survey. There is need of further and more adequate study of the problems of Christian unity from the side of accurate statistical and social research data. The facts regarding the denominational system as it operates in many communities need further assessment and more open statement. Such studies might well indicate the ways and means of realizing the more ideal picture of unity and coöperation. Such studies as have already taken form have been valuable in keeping the issue before the churches. Some kind of philosophic and synthetic overview will continue to be necessary. But in addition there is need of data from social research and surveys. Valuable statistical information may be secured from the religious census and from numerous social researches. There are also the data on the more intimate and personal phases of the problem to be derived from such inquiries as those of H. Paul Douglass, Dr. de Brunner, and others who for the past decade have been studying the different aspects of the American church. Such studies as those made by Professors Holt and Kincheloe, the National Study of Theological Education, and surveys made by church boards and seminaries have contributed basic facts which are of value to those interested in plans for fuller Christian unity. This Conference might well formulate several problems on which it would be well to have additional factual material. Perhaps also a list of such researches as might prove of value as a basis for further study might be prepared.

HERBERT L. WILLETT, *Chairman*
Chicago
EDWARD S. AMES, Chicago
ROBERT A. ASHWORTH, Chicago
S. J. DUNCAN-CLARK, Chicago
CHARLES W. GILKEY, Chicago
JESSE A. JACOBS, Chicago
O. F. JORDON, Park Ridge, Ill.
CHARLES CLAYTON MORRISON, Chicago
HERBERT W. PRINCE, Lake Forest, Ill.
PERRY J. RICE, Chicago
NORRIS L. TIBBETTS, Chicago

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON UNITY MOVEMENTS IN POLITICS, SCIENCE, AND INDUSTRY, AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON UNITY AMONG CHRISTIANS

Recent Movements toward Unity in the Fields of Politics, Science, and Industry Yield Few Examples of Voluntary Mergers of a National Scope where the Identity of the Organizations Participating Is Swallowed Up in a Larger Whole, But Do Reveal the Steady Development and Ever Widening Use of a Technique of Cooperation for a Common End through Conference and through Participation in Organizations of Larger and Larger Range, until World Wide Organization of the Great Majority of All Those Sharing a Common Purpose Is Effected.

Religious Organizations Have Been Somewhat Slower to Avail Themselves of this Technique than Have Organizations in the Fields of Politics, Science, and Industry.

Your Commission may as well say frankly in the beginning that we have discovered in the fields of politics and science no recent mergers involving the voluntary surrender of individual corporate existence to merge in a greater whole, comparable, for example, to the merger of the United Church in Canada in the field of religion. At the only place where such a merger might have taken place to the benefit of those concerned, namely, between Austria and Germany, the merger is prevented by treaties imposed by the Allies and by France and Italy's dread of too powerful a neighbor.

This does not mean, however, that there have been no movements toward unity in the political world. On the contrary the spirit of coöperation between nations has increased and found expression in various international organizations.

First among these is, of course, the League of Nations, including the International Labor Office, the International Committee of Intellectual Cooperation, the International Cinematographic Institute, etc., which are too well known to require comment here; and second, the World Court. Never

before in the history of the world have so many sovereign nations voluntarily avowed a common allegiance to reason and mutually sought the road to understanding.

The International Committee on Intellectual Coöperation was created in the early days of the League because it was believed that truth or science was one and knew no boundaries. Unfortunately, to give effect to the idea, money was necessary, and because money was not available by general assessment as in the case of the League itself, and France was the only nation sufficiently awake to the possibilities of the movement to contribute a substantial sum, the committee accepted the offer of the French government for an annual subsidy of 2½ million francs out of a total budget of 3 million francs for the maintenance of an Institute under the direction of the Committee, which so outweighed the participation of the other governments, removing as it did the center of work from Geneva to Paris, that the Committee has as yet failed to fulfil the high hopes entertained at its founding. It has, however, assembled committees of experts in various fields, held conferences of representatives of international students' organizations, and of directors of national university offices, organized a committee of experts on the instruction of youth in the aims of the League, and interested itself in strengthening the international organizations of museums.

The characteristic feature of the methods pursued by the Committee as defined in the last report presented to the Assembly of the League of Nations by M. Sato of Japan, September 21, 1931, is:—"to bring together, under its ægis the best minds of the various countries to deal with education, art, literature or science. The international questions with which we have to deal in these spheres are innumerable. The Committee does not claim to have elucidated all of these at once. It has made a judicious selection and, when handling those which it has retained, it invariably calls upon the Institute of Intellectual Coöperation to summon a committee of experts. It thus enjoys the benefit of the best advice. It brings into intimate touch the different forms of culture, the most varied experience and the great tendencies of thought. It allows the experts to discuss direct and without any intermediary, the questions with which they are concerned, to compare their methods and to communicate to each other those they deem most satisfactory. It thus proposes to promote and extend progress in all the various branches of intellectual activity. There is no need to add that, in many cases, it thus establishes a new international link between the national departments of education and fine arts and between learned bodies and scientific institutions of the various countries. That is, if I am not mistaken, the supreme purpose of the League of Nations."

The League's reorganized Permanent Committee on Arts and Letters, a sub-committee of experts of the International Committee on Intellectual Coöperation, on which twenty distinguished men and women of twelve nations, including Karl Capek, the Czech author, Thomas Mann, the German

novelist, and John Masefield, the British poet laureate, sit as members, in July 1931, at its first meeting, adopted the following resolution:—

"At the opening of its programme, the Permanent Committee on Arts and Letters desires to state the principles on which it proposes to work.

"The League of Nations implies an association of minds.

"It ought to form a bond of union between those who enrich the life of the mind by creating ideas, inventing forms and combinations of thought, or discovering and interpreting facts.

"Only by the spontaneous communication of mind with mind can this association find expression.

"At a time when the triumphs of technical invention and the prestige which they enjoy are bewildering men's minds and causing uneasiness as to the future of civilization and the direction in which it is moving, more system, vitality, and continuity must be given to these exchanges of thought.

"The Permanent Committee recommends the Committee on Intellectual Coöperation and the Institute:

"1. To encourage an *exchange of letters* between leaders of thought, on the lines of those which have always taken place at the great epochs of European history:

"To select subjects best calculated to serve the common interest of the League of Nations and of the intellectual life of mankind;

"And to publish this correspondence from time to time.

"2. To organize *conversations* between such leaders of thought on definite subjects; for instance, the relations between the intellectual and the practical approach to life, intellectual activity and specialized research, the aims of education—in a word, all that may help us to understand clearly what we mean by 'Man' and 'Civilization.' These discussions should also be published by the Institute;

"3. To study the best means of ensuring that in life as a whole, in its social, economic and political spheres alike, the intellectual element shall be present and play its part;

"4. To encourage meetings calculated to make more widely known the aims, methods and results of intellectual coöperation."

The Committee on Intellectual Coöperation at its meeting in July, 1931, discussed how practical effect might be given to the idea of the exchange of letters.

But without waiting for the adoption of a method, it is said that the French author, M. Paul Valéry, has already entered into an interchange of correspondence with the German author, Thomas Mann, in an effort to formulate a satisfactory definition of "Man."

Other comprehensive political agencies have been proposed and may emerge at any time, such as a permanent Parliament of International Law and Monsieur Briand's proposal for the establishment of a United States of Europe for purposes of solidarity and economic betterment, governed by a European conference with a permanent political committee as executive organ, politi-

cal union and security to take precedence over economic union, so that union rather than unity would be the prevailing idea. It would be an attempt to secure the blessings of corrective economic action while retaining the free exercise of sovereignty and independence.

As yet the United States does not share officially in any of these organizations. Dr. Millikan of California Institute of Technology sits as an individual on the League's Committee on Intellectual Coöperation, and during the eight years 1923-31 the United States Government has made a total of 212 appointments of either official delegates or experts or consultants for participation in conferences and meetings under the League of Nations. The budget of the Federal Government for 1931 carries appropriations for participation in the following international organizations and undertakings:—

Agricultural Department

International Fur Trade Exposition, Leipzig.

Independent Establishment

International Catalogue of Scientific Literature, Smithsonian Institution.
International Exchanges, Smithsonian Institution.

State Department

International American Institute for the Protection of Childhood.
International Bureau of American Republics (Pan-American Union).
International Bureau of Permanent Court of Arbitration.
International Bureau for Publication of Customs Tariffs.
International Bureau of Weights and Measures.
International Commission on Annual Tables of Constants and Numerical Data, Chemical, Physical and Technological, as established by the 7th International Congress of Applied Chemistry in London.
International Exposition of Colonial and Overseas Countries, Paris.
International Fisheries Commission.
International Hydrographic Bureau.
International Institute of Agriculture, Rome.
International Map of the World.
International Office of Public Health.
International Prison Commission.
International Radiotelegraphic Convention.
International Research Council.
International Astronomical Union.
International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry.
International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics.
International Union of Mathematics.
International Union of Scientific Radio-telegraphy.
International Union of Pure and Applied Physics.

International Geographical Union.
International Road Congress.
International Society for Exploration of the Arctic Regions by Airship.
International Statistical Institute, The Hague.
International Trade-Mark Registration Bureau.
Interparliamentary Union for Promotion of International Arbitration.
Pan-American Sanitary Bureau.
Sixth Pan-American Child Congress.
Fourth World's Poultry Congress.
International Hygiene Exhibition, Dresden.
11th Annual Convention, Federation Interallies des Anciens Combattants.
Permanent International Association of Road Congresses.

In his presidential address before the American Council on Education in May 1930, Dean Charles H. Judd said:—"Americans coöperate as a matter of course. The fifty years of persistent practice toward realization of our national motto—*e pluribus unum*—has reduced coöperation to a subconscious habit. Our spontaneous reaction to every proposition is coöperative." Perhaps this is true in the educational world but as applied to politics we are afraid it is wishful thinking, and that Hoover, Coolidge, or Woodrow Wilson, if consulted, would have said that, judging by their experience with Congress, the statement was a shade too rosy.

Mention, however, should be made of the Kellogg-Briand peace pact, as a notable coöperative effort in the field of politics. Apparently, if Father Washington's advice keeps America from playing in its neighbors' yards across the road, it does not bar America from inviting the others to play in her yard, and they have magnanimously done so.

If we turn to industry, obviously the Soviet five-year plan is the greatest movement toward unity in industry the world has known. Whether it should be classed as a voluntary movement toward unity is another question. Even Bernard Shaw in his recent broadcast acknowledged that the alternative to support of the plan for the individual was death. The question is whether anything like a majority of the Russian people would go the way of the five-year plan if the minority of two or three million Communists who are running the show would leave them free to choose. Only time will reveal that.

In industry, until the recent depression, so strong a tendency toward unity has been apparent that the efforts of governments, particularly the United States, have been in the direction of interposing obstacles to union rather than promoting it. The merger of the Standard Oil Co. of New York and the Vacuum Oil Company has been permitted. Bank mergers have been especially numerous. The Equitable Trust is swallowed up by the Chase Bank and not even the name remains, but it makes Chase the largest of all American banks. The Sherman Anti-Trust Law, the recent movements toward taxation of chain stores, the laws forbidding nation-wide branch banking, illustrate the feeling of the people that there is danger in carrying unity too far in industry.

Some change in sentiment has occurred the last year because of increasing competition with the unfettered trusts of other nations, or even with an entire nation itself, as in the case of the Soviet, but the mind of the business world is not yet clear upon this question. American Chambers of Commerce unite to form the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the United States Chamber of Commerce in turn unites with the International Chamber of Commerce.

The New York *World-Telegram,* commenting upon the meeting of the International Chamber of Commerce, held in Washington last May, said:—"Why should one thousand business leaders from some forty countries, meeting in the depths of the world's worst depression, be as lacking in courage and intelligence as their resolutions indicate? Is it because with notable exceptions business men are not yet aware of the new relation to which we have come in this planet? Yet the mere existence of such an organization as the International Chamber of Commerce shows a marked advance. Fifty nations are represented in its organization. The staff consists of 48 men and women, natives of 11 different countries, engaged in serving the economic interests of all countries, and working to bring the whole world into economic harmony by dealing with problems of finance, transportation, communication, customs barriers, flag discrimination, uniform documents, and a thousand subsidiary subjects. It has a mailing list of 500 picked publications which have shown themselves interested in promoting world affairs through giving publicity to the projects sponsored by the Chamber. There have been some 225 special publications produced by the International Chamber, most of them printed in three languages. The International Chamber of Commerce has no authority to issue orders. It does not command but presents proposals. It writes the prescription; the world of trade must have the prescription filled. Governments must take the remedy." (Economic World Welfare, Amos Stote, Paris, France, in *World Unity.*)

If we turn from movements which have found expression in action to movements of thought not yet crystallized in action, we find an ever increasing emphasis being placed upon the economic unity of the world. It is astounding, for example, how clearly the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church meeting in Denver could see a compelling unity in the political and economic worlds and could chart the immediate course for governments apparently without any suspicion that the same skies and mundane conditions might have a compelling message for unity in religion. The Pastoral Letter issued at Denver, October, 1931, reads:—"We covet for our country the courage to lead along the pathway of world peace . . . by more general and wholehearted coöperation and conference with the nations of the world, especially through official participation in such existing international agencies as tend toward world peace."

"In all our thinking upon the conditions in which we find ourselves it

is necessary to see the world as a unit. Geographically it has become such. The mountains and seas which once separated nation from nation have lost their meaning, and, in an area no longer divided into separate compartments, racial and economic barriers to intercommunication are doomed. The spiritual barriers of prejudice and suspicion, based as they are upon the age-long habits of more or less self-sufficient groups, can be dissolved only by the will to recognize the unity of mankind. No economic methods can meet the physical necessities of the people which are not conceived in terms of the whole. No international relations can be stable which are not universal in their scope; no moral standards permanent which are not valid for all men. No salvation is possible unless it includes all mankind. This world view has been the Christian view from the beginning. The ideal has never faded altogether, though the divisive influence of group loyalties and animosities has obscured it, and prevented its realization." (New York *Times,* October 1, 1931.)

Owen D. Young does not find the skies so clear. In an address at the Lotus Club, December 6, 1930, he declared that politics and economics are in conflict: that the former is becoming more nationalistic the world over, while the latter with great rapidity is becoming more international. He agrees with the bishops that, "*Economics is refusing to recognize frontiers and is forcing itself toward an integrated world.*"

Dr. H. S. Person of the Taylor Society, in his address on Scientific Management at the World Social Economic Congress held at Amsterdam, August, 1931, under the auspices of the International Industrial Relations Association, said:—"The world is in effect a single economic system, and the improved or impaired productivity and consumption of every part affects every other part. . . . Logic compels us to consider the necessity of ultimate stabilization of world industry, by world scale application of the principles of scientific management. All the forces of national habits, prejudices, chauvinism, and entrenched self-interest are arrayed against such an ultimate application of the principles. Yet boldness in thinking and eventually in conduct ever have been the basis of progress." (Scientific Management as a Philosophy and Technique of Progressive Industrial Stabilization.)

Eugene M. Stevens, Chairman of the Board of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, in an address before the national bank division of the American Bankers Association at Atlantic City, October 5, 1931, said:—"But beyond this there is a vision that comes to us through the clouds which now encompass us. The striking progress made within our generation in transportation and communication has brought the whole world together as never before and has opened the way for tremendous progress in trade. If the world should become wise enough to get over the false nationalistic conceptions and its ideas of national self-sufficiency, which has been increasingly evident since the Versailles Treaty, and to tear down all sorts of barriers

which have been erected by various governments—and thereupon the natural and free flow of trade and commerce between the nations may be unimpeded—we should have then in this country the greatest prosperity it has ever known." (*United States Daily,* October 8, 1931.)

At the meeting of the International Chamber of Commerce held in Washington in May, 1931, Sir Arthur Salter said:—"Never has history seen such a tragic demonstration of the fundamental solidarity and interdependence of the world's interests, and of the imperative need for concerted world effort in research, in consultation, in policy and in action. Happily the world has, as a spur to such efforts, not only the prospect of disaster that threatens in its absence, but a rich promise if it succeeds."

William Beard, writing in *The American Political Science Review* for August, 1931 (Vol. XXV, No. 3, p. 522), on the subject "Technologies and Boundaries," said:—"A new human purpose of the efficient production and transportation of goods according to the requirements of engineering rationality is at work in the world running counter to and altering the old purposes of defense, nationalism and administrative convenience. Lawyers, political scientists and statesmen will have to reckon with them, and boundaries, districts and inter-unit relations will have to be reconsidered in the light of its insistent demands. . . . Mankind is sectional in outlook, carving the world into little compartments with mile upon mile of boundary lines. Technology, on the other hand, is inherently universal in outlook. Nature's laws operate as inevitably in Spain as in China, in Russia, as in Australia. . . . The railway needs no introduction as a map-slashing agency. It has pierced the Alps, connecting Switzerland and Italy by way of the famous Simplon tunnel. It has crossed the towering Andes, linking Argentine with Chile. It has reached out through Siberia, tying China and the Pacific with the countries of Western Europe, and its speeds the traveler through a veritable maze of Balkan nations. Electrical designers creating super power nets of transmission lines run wires with utter abandon across national and local frontiers, joining Switzerland and France over the Alps in one net, and North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and Tennessee in another. To permit a translation of progress in science and invention into practice, various remedies for the boundary problems have been formulated and put into use. A ready answer to the difficulties raised by a single set of boundaries and a single engineering project is to make the former fit the special requirements. Special districts are established."

Perhaps the economic world needed the depression to teach it the truth of Paul's doctrine that we are all members one of another. There is, at any rate, no question that the economic world has had a lesson it will not forget immediately. Can we profit by this lesson in economics or will it require a special lesson to teach us that the same law applies in the field of religion?

If we turn now to science, reference has already been made to the move-

ments set on foot by the League of Nations for knitting together the mind of the world. Organization toward unity has already gone very far in science, at least in form.

The American Council on Education in 1929 suggested and financed the publication of a year book on international organizations which was published in Paris by the League of Nations Institute of Intellectual Coöperation in English, French, and German. The book lists 688 organizations in Europe established to promote international exchanges and of interest or assistance to university professors and students from other countries. The preface states, "Our desire in presenting this work has been to advocate that every '*civis academicus*' as a matter of course should enjoy a citizen's right throughout the whole academic world, and further that common membership in the realm of learning under the ægis of the university should act as an effective bond of union between the various cultural and national groups in Europe."

General Smuts, in his address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, in Liverpool, October, 1931, said:—"Life is not an entity, physical or other. It is a type of organization. If that organization is interfered with, we are left not certain bits of life, but with death. The nature of living things is determined not by the nature of their parts but by the nature or principle of their organization. The living individual is a physiological whole in which the parts or organs are but differentiations of the whole for purposes of greater efficiency, and lead to organic continuity throughout. This conception applies not only to individuals but also to organic society such as the beehive or the ants' nest, and even the social organizations on the human level. It is a strange new universe, impalpable and immaterial, consisting not of material or stuff but of organization of patterns of 'Wholes' which are unceasingly being woven into more complex or simpler designs." The parts are not the explanation of the whole. The whole is the explanation of the parts.

The world of science is closely knit in functional, national and international organizations. The workers in any branch of natural science have their own departmental organization. These in turn are represented in the various divisions of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The National Research Council observes with a comprehensive eye the entire field of research in the natural sciences in America. This highly important research organization was established by the National Academy of Science in 1916, at the request of President Wilson, as a measure of national preparedness. The usefulness of its work led to an executive order of May 11, 1918, requesting that the Council be perpetuated, (1) to stimulate research in the mathematical, physical, and biographical sciences, and in the application of these sciences to engineering, agriculture, medicine, and other useful arts, (2) "to survey the larger possibilities of science, to formulate comprehensive programs of research, and to develop effective means of util-

izing the scientific and technical resources of the country," (3) to promote coöperation in research, at home and abroad, and (4) to engage in other work collateral to these objects. As reorganized at this time, the Council became, in even a larger degree than before, a coöperative association of the scientific and technical men of the country, with a considerable mixture of business men interested in engineering and industry. It enjoys the coöperation of the major scientific and technical societies, its membership being largely composed of representatives of over seventy of these societies, together with representatives of other research organizations, representatives of government scientific bureaus, and a limited number of members at large. Although partly supported during the war period by the government, the Council is now maintained entirely from other than governmental sources, and is controlled exclusively by its own representatively selected membership and democratically chosen officers. It expects to keep up a close coöperation with the government scientific bureaus, but it is itself in no sense a government bureau.

The Council is neither a large operating scientific laboratory, nor a repository of large funds to be given away to scattered scientific workers or institutions. It is rather an organization which, while clearly recognizing the unique value of individual work, hopes especially to bring together scattered work and workers, and to assist in coördinating, in some measure, scientific attack in America upon large problems in any and all lines of scientific activity, especially, perhaps, upon those problems which depend for successful solution on the coöperation of several or many workers and laboratories either within the realm of a single science or representing different realms in which various parts of a single problem may lie.

Canada has also a National Research Council. Both will participate in May, 1932, in the Fifth Pacific Science Congress. There is also an International Research Council which met in Brussels in July, 1931, of which the National Research Council of the United States is a member. With this International Research Council are affiliated several departmental unions, such as the International Union of Chemistry, the International Astronomical Union, the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics, the International Scientific Radio Union, and the International Geographical Union. As already indicated, some of these organizations receive recognition in the Federal Budget and it is regarded as highly important to provide increased resources for the international coördination of scientific work.

In the humanistic field professors are organized functionally in learned societies, of which there are at least a score. These learned societies in turn coöperate in the Council of Learned Societies Devoted to Humanistic Studies, which in turn is a member of the International Union of Academies, made up of similar organizations from 16 countries, including Japan and Russia. The President of the Union is a Frenchman, the Vice-Presidents English and Danish, the Secretary Belgian, and the Adjunct Secretaries, Italian and Roumanian.

National associations of institutions and other national educational associations to the total number of 25 have united to form the American Council on Education, which, because of the American system which makes education from the government point of view a function of the separate states, is the most comprehensive and representative organization in American education to-day.

In the world of research there has been organized also the Social Science Research Council to undertake for the social sciences the work which the National Research Council undertakes for the natural sciences.

In the field of research in religion the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has been active, and also the Council of Church Boards of Education. Research in this field has also been carried on by the Institute for Social and Religious Research, founded by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

Science has been able to obtain the universe embracing hypotheses which control human thought to-day because it has utilized the observations of students stationed in all quarters of the earth. No single observer could ever have arrived at the theory of geological continuity, for example. An heroic effort is now being made in the much more complex field of education and human relations to develop a technique and to set at leisure for the task minds of sufficient capacity to assemble the facts and generalize upon human development or behavior.

There is every prospect that the focus of interest before the twentieth century ends will be upon human relations and that we shall apply scientific methods to this study of social data similar to those which have been so successfully applied to physical phenomena the last hundred years. It is not without significance that a Frenchman and a German, even before the reverberations of war have died away, are coöperating to draw up a definition of Man.

Perhaps this Christian Unity League will undertake as its particular research problem in that universal study of man which is approaching the task of testing the validity of that observation of Thomas Carlyle:—"A man, be the heavens ever praised, is sufficient for himself. Yet were ten men united in love, capable of being and doing what ten thousand singly would fail in."

As Professor William McDougall has said in the introduction to his radio talks on "Love and Hate: A Study of the Energies of Men and Nations":

"The physical sciences have added immensely to the comforts and conveniences of mankind. This they have achieved in the main by teaching us how to release, control, and direct, the energies of the physical world about us. In spite of these great achievements the world is in a parlous state. The further applications and advances of physical science can do nothing to diminish our difficulties and dangers; they must, rather, accentuate them.

"The biological sciences have inevitably (by reason of the greater difficulty of their problems) lagged behind. Only the further progress of these sciences can enable us to use wisely the vast stores of physical energy now

at our disposal, to direct them to the enduring betterment of man's estate. This means that we must learn to release, control, and direct, the energies within us; for these are the energies that express themselves in all choice and volition, in the characters of men and nations, in history, in economics, in politics, in religion, in all individual and collective effort. Hitherto these inner energies have been largely wasted in conflicts and misdirected strivings, the sources of all unhappiness. The task before our civilization, on which all else depends, is, through deeper understanding of the energies of men, to harmonize their working in one vast coöperative effort, an effort which, avoiding all major conflicts and wasteful misdirections, shall ensure us against the threatening decline and fall of our civilization."

JOHN H. MACCRACKEN, *Chairman*
Washington, D. C.
ROBERT BAGNELL, Harrisburg, Pa.
EDWARD BLEAKNEY, Pittsburgh, Pa.
WILBUR L. CASWELL, Yonkers, N. Y.
MILTON G. EVANS, Chester, Pa.
J. A. MACCALLUM, Philadelphia, Pa.
KARL REILAND, New York City
GUY EMERY SHIPLER, New York City.
J. S. LADD THOMAS, Philadelphia, Pa.
ROBERT R. WICKS, Princeton, N. J.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON CHRISTIANITY AND WORLD RELIGION

I. An Ancient Problem

Some two thousand years ago there had emerged in the lands lying around the Mediterranean sea a civilization at once compact and cosmopolitan. Under the authority of the Roman empire with its roads, its posts, and its far-reaching administrative system, men of various races and varying religious types were drawn into close contact. Into this religious and racial intermingling there entered a new Gospel. The new religion proved to be an active agent, having the nature of leaven, creative of change in all that it touched, and it evoked in that comparatively small world a series of religious readjustments comparable to a geological transformation of the surface of the earth. Changing other types it was also hospitable to change, drawing into itself elements of life worked out before its appearance, philosophy from the Greeks, organization from the Romans, forms of thought from the mystery cults. Thus, if it ended much that was already dying, it conserved and offered new scope to much that was deserving of life. It solved its problem by coming not to destroy but to fulfil. So transforming and being transformed, it initiated one of the major streams of religious development, which flowing mainly toward the West (for reasons that deserve to be discussed), arrives with its energy unexhausted into our own times. Yet, in all its manifold changes, it has succeeded in preserving its own identity through the universally admitted principle of personal allegiance to Jesus Christ, confessed Leader and Lord of all its generations, its types, and its schools.

II. The Modern Problem

In our own time this ancient situation repeats itself upon a vaster scale. Again the ends of the earth are met, but now it is not the lesser *orbis terrarum* of the ancients but the entire world that comes together for conference and conflict. Swift and sure means of communication multiply the contacts of peoples. Economic interdependence reduces to one the voices of mankind crying, "Give us this day our daily bread." Distance ceases to be a barrier

to the spread of ideas; what was thought yesterday in Bombay strikes its sparks in a few hours from minds all round the world. The contractions of time and space draw the continents together, so that all problems tend to become world problems. And all this means that the machinery for a world comradeship and coöperation has been created. It means further that for the first time in history an universal religion begins to be physically practicable. The races and the religions of man are everywhere in contact; the world begins to be one body; it waits for one spirit—of hate or love—to come and dwell within it. And in this world it is laid upon the great historic religions to say whether religion shall become a bond of unity or continue to be a source of deep division.

III. Actual Unity

Any unity, however, in order to be more than a specious and artificial pose needs to be based upon a fact. In the world of religion the unifying fact may be described as an universal search after God and an universal, though various, experience of God. In the light of the modern study of history the abrupt division of religions into true and false becomes impossible. There is no religion which has not in its course developed both truth and error. Human religion represents in its essence one outreach of the spirit of man in response to the continuing approach to man of the Spirit of the Divine. And though the concepts used are various and the cultus employed is diverse in its details, there is a core of identity that persists through all differences. For in all sincere religion men are aware of the presence of Deity and seek to establish and increase their fellowship with Him. Individual men may revolt against religion, but Man walks with God. There is, thus, a substance of religion which transcends the bounds of any particular religion and is common to all races and times. Nor are any of the differences that separate religious men so great as the stupendous fact that, living in the visible world, they are agreed in finding the source and goal of their spiritual life in the invisible world of the Divine. And in this fact there is ground for the recognition of a world-wide and age-old fellowship, even the fellowship of the mystery which man is able neither to comprehend nor to put aside.

IV. Religious Growth

In the experience of the mystery by man and in His response to man there is discernible, if sufficiently long views be taken, a continuing progress. In the earliest days of man's life his religion takes simple and immature forms; the Divine is dimly discovered in nature and in the social customs and institutions of the tribe. Upon the basis of these primitive forms are erected the greater historic religions of the world. And in these religions

certain lines of growth are traceable. There is a movement, discoverable in many lands, from polytheism toward some fashion of conceiving God as one Being; there is a line of growth from vague ideas of God as just the vitality resident in nature toward the conception of Him as in some sense personal; there is an increasing stress upon God as an ethical Being who requires righteousness of His worshippers; there is an evolution from mass religion, which makes no grave demands upon the individual, toward religion which asks for his personal faith and loyalty. There emerges, too, in many religions the hope of salvation from some evil into some desired good. To the working out of these great themes the higher religions give themselves. And while growth is interrupted and intermittent—degeneration being a common phenomenon in all religion—yet is the progress sufficiently widespread to give to historic religion something of the unity and dignity of one movement. It has something of the nature of a great dialogue of question and revelation between man and God.

V. The Nature of Religion

Religion is a complex rather than simple activity of the soul and may be variously described so as to bring this or that aspect of it into view. It has been well defined as the intuition of "a Beyond which is Akin" (Matthews after Boutroux). Its fundamental content may, perhaps, be more fully expressed, in terms not substantially different, as loving awe in the presence of the mystery of God which seeks the illumination and vitalization of life through fellowship with God. In all the history of religion the kinship of the Divine with the human and the transcendence of the Divine above the human are seen in interaction; in all its history religion oscillates between stress upon the nearness and upon the remoteness of God. In all religion men look for and experimentally receive an interpretation of the meaning and ends of life. Through all religion men look for rescue into some higher type of life than that which they now possess. Though the interpretations are manifold and the versions of "the life indeed" different, the structural content is everywhere akin. Religion is a common enterprise of man.

VI. Two Main Types

Alternate stress upon the mystery and upon the kinship of God seems to issue in two main religious types in the presence of which all other religious differences fade into comparative insignificance.

1. In one type the Divine is wholly "beyond," so that no description or picturization of Him is possible. Thought stands helpless before the infinite greatness of God and any assertion about Him is a falsehood. He is best conceived as an eternally placid ocean of existence who is identical with all

things yet not capable of being apprehended under any known form of being. In His presence history is meaningless and historic revelation vain. Access to Him can be had only through a secret pathway of ecstatic vision which leaves behind a world well lost and achieves a union with the Divine which, in some forms of this type, means permanent deliverance from the burden of individual life. The highest life is loss of life in God.

2. The second type, taking the kinship of God more seriously, finds itself able to conceive Him more definitely in terms of personality. And since personality is or expresses itself in reason, purpose, and will it understands history as a realistic process through which the ends of God are being achieved and in which revelations of God may be received. Knowledge of God may be won through reflection upon the course of nature and of history, and direct access to God may be had in prayer. Prayer retains throughout the characteristics of a dialogue rather than a meditation that may issue at last in the loss of all sense of difference between the divine and the human spirits. And the religious life of surrender to God finds its deepest expression in active coöperation with God toward the realization of His ends. The concrete problems of history must be solved through a Divine-human creative achievement rather than through the insight that they do not exist. The kingdom of God must be not only discovered but made.

3. These two types appear and re-appear in all religions. The first type, for example, is to be found in Mohammedan Sufiism, in the philosophy of Lao-tse in China, and in the Neo-Platonic strain in historic Christianity, in the higher theology of India. In the milder forms of mysticism the two types often fuse, but in their characteristic forms they are to be distinguished "as two poles of the higher piety" (Heiler). Yet it is true also that the greater religions of mankind are chiefly characterized by the predominance of one type or the other. Thus the second type may be said to control the religious history of Confucianism, Zoroastrianism, the Religion of Israel, Mohammedanism, and Christianity while the first has dominated the religious experience of India. Yet even in India a Pantheistic philosophy has been largely qualified by the practice of a personalistic religion. The One has been largely worshipped through the many gods of a personal polytheism.

VII. Divine Personality

It is likely that any religion that undertakes to meet the needs of mankind as these have displayed themselves in history must conserve within itself the two elements of mystery and kinship. Its God must be great enough to be wholly worshipful and near enough to evoke human loyalty and love. Nor is it likely that any religion will permanently prevail that strips individual human lives of meaning and value. The will-to-live is stronger in us than any other interest—is, indeed, the mother of all our interests. The offences against these principles are not all in one direction.

If the East has sometimes refused any image of God, the West has often made Him too completely in our own image. Yet in the idea of the Divine as personal, conceived with sufficient spaciousness, the religious interests of man would seem to be realized. For if personality, understood as rational, sensitive, and purposeful will, is near to us—is, indeed, the form of being that we ourselves are engaged in fashioning—it is also the highest and deepest thing known to us. Nor is it empty of mystery but rather full of unexplored possibilities. Germinal and tentative in ourselves, its features, as we know them, point us outward toward ranges of existence that lie beyond our conceiving—toward a reason beyond all our reasonings, a purpose great enough to use and complete all our purposings, a will worthy of our utmost worship and service. In the power of personality to love, we are brought in touch with the richest order of experience conceivable by us. And in the conception of the world as a field for the exercise of creative purpose, divine and human, looking toward the production of ever higher forms of personal life, our ordinary experience is given significance in the hope of a future which is the realization and not the cancellation of our past. Thus in personal fatherhood, worthily conceived, we may be hopeful that our race will ultimately discover its origin and its spiritual home.

VIII. Jesus Christ

In such a discovery Christian folk may expect Jesus Christ to be the continuing pioneer and leader. In Him the elements of mystery and revelation are united, since "no one knoweth the Father save the Son and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal Him." He has, over many centuries, shown his power to persuade into his discipleship and so bring into the presence of the Father, men of diverse ages, races, temperaments, degrees of culture, and levels of civilization. He leads by far the greater portion of the religious life of five continents and his outposts are planted throughout the sixth. His qualitative universality has been experimentally demonstrated, and he has become at once the most unique and the most universally effective figure in all human religious history. Those who seek the complete religious unity of man, therefore, do well to centre their hopes upon him, trusting and assisting him to accomplish a task the completion of which is otherwise beyond the wit of man to conceive.

IX. His Method

In this enterprise he works with entire confidence in the power of truth to evoke, sooner or later, the response of the human soul. In his historic ministry he put aside all external aids and sought his results as a wandering teacher and preacher. "If I say the truth, why do ye not believe me?" And for the complete success of his work the same spirit must rule His disciples. In the work of Christian missions the psychology of attack and defense is

out of place. To share rather than to impart, to serve rather than to rule, to create rather than to conquer must be the aims.

X. Two Ideal Results

1. *Fulfilment.* So led of the Spirit of Christ we may look forward to two results. First, the universal discovery of the God and Father of Jesus Christ will be the contradiction of the central import of no religion, but rather the realization of the intention of all religions. In Christ there is a singularly rich offer of the intimacy of fellowship and the inspiration of worship issuing in fullness of life, which are the meanings of all human approaches to God. Christ can be trusted, moreover, to single out, in a long-continued historic process, those elements in all religions—including historic Christianity—that are permanent and worthy of conservation and development. He will refuse no contribution from any source that has in it truth. His Lordship need be the defeat of no religion but will be rather the victory of all. He comes always not to destroy but to fulfil.

2. *Continued Progress.* His universal leadership will not be the end of religious progress. It will be the beginning of an era of growth to which no limits can be set. The principle of progress is written deep into Christianity in its doctrine of a Divine Spirit that will continually guide men into all truth and life. Nor can any religion completely realize its own meanings save in some universal religion. There is in all religion an inherent principle of universality which increasingly makes a local religion a self-contradiction. None of us shall possess our utmost earthly knowledge of God until one God is known through all the earth; none can experience the full quickening of worship until our worship is one; none can receive fully the love of God until we know ourselves as brethren, the children of one Father; none can explore fully the opportunities of life in the world until it becomes for all, "Eternal Life in the midst of time by the strength and under the eyes of God."

W. Cosby Bell, *chairman,*
Alexandria, Va.
Edmund B. Chaffee, New York
Daniel J. Fleming, New York
Charles W. Flint, Syracuse, N. Y.
John Grier Hibben, Princeton, N. J.
Finis S. Idleman, New York
W. Beatty Jennings, Philadelphia
Rufus M. Jones, Haverford, Pa.
John H. Melish, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Robert Norwood, New York
Francis G. Peabody, Cambridge, Mass.
Frank K. Sanders, Rockport, Mass.
Beverley D. Tucker, Jr., Richmond, Va.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE MESSAGE OF THE CONFERENCE

TWO KINDS of forces are steadily and irresistibly working toward Christian unity. One springs from the outward circumstances which confront the churches; the other rises from the inner experience and clearing vision of the churches themselves.

The churches of Christ have never faced more urgent and momentous human need than to-day. We invent machines, increase production, and create wealth; yet unemployment threatens multitudes with starvation. We praise democracy; yet economic injustices deprive millions of opportunity for abundant life. We seek peace; yet we arm for war on a scale hitherto undreamed, and passions which could be vented with the puny weapons of the last century now threaten to engulf the earth and destroy the race. We speed through the air in flight, and speak across the continents and the seas; yet the very swiftness of our communication begets new and strange fears. Mankind is like an organism which has developed abnormally sensitive peripheral nerves, but lacks central intelligence to control its reactions. Sin abounds, but men call it "the new morality." A modern paganism has emerged, which knows no reticence, abhors restraint, and challenges the whole Christian ethic and philosophy of life. The intensity and extent of the world's need for the moral and spiritual resources that are in Christ, and the strength of the forces which are competing with him for the minds and wills of men—these call with an urgency that cannot be evaded for closer and deeper union among the churches. Only a united Christendom is strong enough to deal with the confusion and evil of our day.

The experience of the churches is leading them to an increasingly common vision of their Lord. There is, and doubtless always will be, a great variety of religious experience in Christian churches. Yet the most significant of the characteristics of the life and thought of the churches in this decade is the degree to which one common understanding and apprehension of Christian truth is shared by all the churches. In the largest sense of the word, Christ is not divided. The churches are not holding before the world a dozen portraits of Christ, but one. Their minds are converging upon common ground. Their thought is increasingly occupied, not with the incidental and outlying provinces of the Christian message, but with its great central truths—that God is what Jesus Christ revealed him to be; that the things for which Jesus lived and died are the very axis of the universe,

the central values from which all of life derives its meaning; that through him power is available here and now to redeem individuals and to remake society. There is an increasingly clear common conviction that Christ is the answer to human need; that mankind can gain its full stature only as the mind of Christ becomes the mind of the world, and as the whole of our common life, even in its political relations and its economic and social framework, is ordered in the light of his principles and undergirded by the power of his Spirit.

Difference is not in itself wrong. Because the exhaustless being of God lies beyond our power fully to comprehend and describe, there is always room for honest differences of insight, conviction, and emphasis. Differences of doctrinal formulation arise when men reflect upon the meaning and import of the Christian gospel, undertake to interpret Christian experience, and attempt in successive generations or from the points of view of different cultures to state the Christian convictions in terms that are generally intelligible because consonant with current concepts and language. Differences in practices and polity are associated with changing circumstances and the varying heritages and responsibilties of different national, racial and social groups. Such differences are not only tolerable; they are desirable and necessary, if the Spirit of Christ is to have free reign. He seeks, not uniformity, but unity.

When difference becomes disunion, and when disunion becomes exclusion and competition, we sin against the law of love, which is the central principle of the gospel of Christ. We have too often so sinned. We have magnified irrelevancies and have confused values. Things which Jesus made small we have made great. Things which he made great we have made small. We have obstructed the redemptive power of the Spirit of Christ by the barriers of unnecessary separations; we have made the way of discipleship difficult by creedal elaborations; and we have complacently rested in the weakness of a divided life and fellowship.

In the face of the forces which are to-day leading us toward Christian unity, we are challenged to make our institutions, as well as our personal wills, clear channels for the empowering, unifying Spirit of Christ. We can be content with no unity of indifference, no mere blurring over of distinctions. The call is to make effective in all that we are and do the central Christian convictions. We may well say, "God be thanked who matched us with this hour." We may well pray for wisdom, grace, and courage to enter into a new unity of life and organization by which our common vision of one Lord may be carried to the healing of the world's need.

Institutions move slowly, but in the end they respond to the convictions and purposes of the individuals who compose them. Not in disparagement of other movements toward Christian unity, and not in competition with any, but in the hope of reinforcing these movements and hastening their consummation, we come together as individuals in the Christian Unity League. We pledge ourselves, and invite all Christians throughout

the world, of every nation, race, creedal heritage or denominational polity, to join with us, in this Pact of Reconciliation:

We, Christians of various churches, believing that only in a coöperative and united Christendom can the world be Christianized, deplore a divided Christendom as being opposed to the spirit of Christ and the needs of the world. We, therefore, desire to express our sympathetic interest in and prayerful attitude toward all conferences, small and large, that are looking toward reconciliation of the divided church of Christ.

We acknowledge the equality of all Christians before God and propose to follow this principle, as far as possible, in all our spiritual fellowships. We will strive to bring the laws and practices of our several communions into conformity with this principle, so that no Christian shall be denied membership in any of our churches, nor the privilege of participation in the observance of the Lord's Supper, and that no Christian minister shall be denied the freedom of our pulpits by reason of differences in forms of ordination.

We pledge, irrespective of denominational barriers, to be brethren one to another in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Savior, whose we are and whom we serve. *

Luther A. Weigle, *Chairman*
New Haven, Conn.
John Clark Archer, New Haven, Conn.
Roland H. Bainton, New Haven, Conn.
George S. Lackland, New Haven, Conn.
Douglas Clyde Macintosh, New Haven, Conn.
Halford E. Luccock, New Haven, Conn.
Behrend Mehrtens, New Haven, Conn.
Oscar E. Maurer, New Haven, Conn.
H. Richard Niebuhr, New Haven, Conn.
George Stewart, Stamford, Conn.
Henry Hallam Tweedy, New Haven, Conn.
Howard Weir, New Haven, Conn.

* Editor's Note: The conference suggested a slight revision in this report, making it somewhat more adventurous in its utterance; but, up to this time, the report has not been received from the commission in its revised form, so it is published unrevised.

The closing address of the Cleveland Conference

THE PRICE TO BE PAID TO ENSURE CHRISTIAN UNITY

By Dr. John R. Mott
President of the International Missionary Council, New York

The two greatest, most difficult and most important undertakings committed to the Christians are, first, to make Jesus Christ known, trusted, obeyed, and exemplified in individual life and human relationship; and to this end, secondly, to bring about such a union of his followers as he had in mind when he prayed that "they may all be one . . . that the world may believe." To achieve such stupendous and beneficient results involves like great and vital causes. If we as Christians have not made greater progress in realizing the vision of our Lord the reason is not far to seek. We have concerned ourselves in our thought, discussion, and action with the consideration of the need and importance of Christian unity and the obstacles and objections, and not enough with the price which has to be paid. Christ, under circumstances when men would attempt a great constructive task, enjoined upon them to count the cost. In sermons on this searching requirement one often misses emphasis on two extremely significant points: first, that the injunction to count the cost implies that the achievement of the result will be costly; and secondly, that in estimating the cost we must do so not only with definiteness and accuracy but also and especially *with reference to paying it.* With this solemn reminder of Christ in mind, the heeding or not heeding of which makes all the difference in the world, as to the part we are to have in fulfilling his unmistakable wish, let us consider quite simply and frankly the price which has to be paid by us Christians of different names to facilitate the realization of the vital and triumphant unity for which he prayed.

At the outset let me call attention to the need among Christians everywhere of larger knowledge and understanding of church history. It is essential that we enter more comprehensively, penetratingly, and sympathetically into the antecedents and background, near and remote, of the various Christian communions, and that we seek to trace their evolution or progress and estimate their most distinctive contributions and values. Their present-day trends, major issues, and programs should be taken into view. Much time will be saved if we give attention to the subject of eirenics, more especially of the efforts of the last half century at reconciling differences between different Christian bodies.

No subject calls for more real thought power than this one of Christian unity. The terse sentence of Bishop Gore, in explaining why certain grave problems remained unsolved, would apply to us Christians as we confront this central problem, "We do not think, and we do not pray." What should characterize our thinking? It should be fresh; in few fields is there greater room for original thought. It must be comprehensive; from the nature of the case it calls more than most subjects for marked ability to understand and appreciate the experience and point of view of those from whom we differ. The thinking must be thorough-going and penetrating; there is nothing to be gained but much to be lost in evading, neglecting or minimizing the existence, significance, and full weight of any facts or inferences which those with whom we are dealing regard as pertinent. There is a demand at every stage of our thinking for courage coupled with sincerity, and, in sharing the results of our thinking, for downright candor coupled with Christian courtesy and love. Above all let our thinking be constructive, and, so far as possible, conclusive. By conclusive thinking I mean thinking which arrives at definite conclusions which can be clearly set forth in writing. This of course does not mean that we cease to keep the mind open to receive and welcome new light from any quarter, even the most unwelcome quarter, and to revise our judgments accordingly. With reference to the price which has to be paid in the thought realm attention should be called to the value of group thinking in which minds supplement or complement each other, and likewise stimulate and enrich each other. In fact, the most notable progress made in recent years in the furtherance of unity among Christians is due in considerable measure to such creative groups.

At the foundation of any enduring structure of Christian unity must be a comprehensive educational campaign. In the present democratic age this process is of added importance. The genuine unity we so much desire cannot be imposed by fiat from above. While it will doubtless be initiated by small groups, or it may be by some one prophetic thinker and advocate, if the vision and the plan are to be realized the rank and file of the bodies of Christians concerned must be informed and persuaded as to the great desirability of the measure. It was the extensive sweep and the intensive thoroughness of this educational process, covering virtually every parish and group in the three Christian denominations concerned, which explains the strength of the movement resulting in the United Church of Canada. In this connection we commend the current educational campaign among groups specially involved in the expanding unity movement in South India.

Christians everywhere who desire to advance the cause of Christian unity must discipline themselves by cultivating the habit of reminding themselves that they, although members of separate Christian communions, are one. Being one in their mystical, vital union with Christ, being one in their honest desire to become more and more like him, and being one in the dominant purpose to make his reign some day coëxtensive with the inhabited earth and triumphant in all human relationships, we Christians of different names

are in reality one. This is true whether we feel at one with each other or not. It is true whether we have or have not allowed ourselves to think so. The unity of the vast majority of members of the Christian Church through the centuries has already been realized. They to-day constitute the "Church Triumphant" and are engaged in the high offices of contemplation, praise and service. And is it not true that on this earth there already exists the Body of Christ of which all true Christians are members? What could be more central in human experience than the three greatest facts which the Christians share in common—the Incarnation, the Cross or Atonement, and the Resurrection? Our task is not to create unity, but to manifest it, and to do so with such reality that even the keenest critic and unbeliever will recognize it as a reality. Another price which has to be paid and which too often we neglect to pay, or shrink from paying, is that of repentance and confession. We need to dwell on our divisions under the blaze of the light of Christ's example and command of love, and likewise under the shadow of his Cross designed for the breaking down of all that divides, until the great sinfulness of what created and perpetuates separation among his disciples breaks in upon us, awakens conscience and then leads us to confess and forsake our part in the sin. Not until there is more evidence of piercing conviction of the sins of intolerance, uncharitableness, pride, and selfishness, exhibited in our lives by right attitudes in secret thoughts and motives as well as in speech and other relationships, will that deep sub-soil work of the Spirit take place which is basic to triumphant unity. While it is fitting that wherever Christians assemble for worship there be genuine corporate confessions of common sins, this does not take the place of individual or personal repentance and confession. The sins must not only be confessed but also be forsaken, and, above all, be followed by fruits meet for repentance. In other words Christ's requirement about counting the cost involves something very costly.

The large unity which we strive to realize and manifest demands larger comprehension in our thinking, planning, and sacrificial action. As has been said by more than one apostle of unity, the unity we seek involves not compromise for the sake of peace and worldly success but comprehension for the sake of life and larger truth. We want not mere undenominationalism but something with much more strength, richness, and vitality. We seek not the oneness of dull, colorless uniformity, but rather unity in diversity. Our object is not so much to abolish or minimize our differences but to compose them. Differences of conviction, administration, order, and historical or cultural inheritance will all take their proper place in relation to the kingdom of God. No one Christian communion now in existence is big enough to manifest adequately Christ's full purpose and program. He and his designs and resources are so infinite that he requires all communions and all individuals who acknowledge and bow down to his deity through whom to communicate fully his mind and impulses of love and power.

If the organic, triumphant unity for which Christ prayed is to be real-

ized the leaders, yes and the followers, in our churches must dwell or live much more on the mountains of Christian experience. Manifestly we do not frequent as we should the mount of vision. I mean that mount from which we see the kingdoms of this world becoming the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ that he may reign forever and ever. With reference to furthering the realization of our Christian unity there is a great advantage in being on this height from which we can see things in their true proportion. If we form our judgments on the dead level of the plains or in the mists of the valleys our estimates and opinions are often untrue to the facts. From such an angle the difficulties may seem insuperable whereas looking down on them from the height they may seem quite compassable. Still more do we need to sojourn on the mount of transfiguration—that clear and holy elevation where we see no man save Jesus only, and then find it easier to see our Christian brothers of other names as Jesus sees them, and thus come to understand each other and to discover how necessary we are to each other in the carrying out of his plans. It is this which leads me to pause and emphasize the very great importance of retreats of groups of Christians of our various Christian churches. These should be multiplied on every hand with the end in view of bringing about *vivid realization* of our oneness. No other one means has more highly multiplying possibilities. Though we may hold back from it, we cannot escape following our Lord to the mount of sacrifice. In the lonely, rugged heights of suffering and sacrifice we are admitted to the deeper understanding of the price he paid for unity and that his disciples must ever pay. I have come to distrust any unity which is purchased at any lesser price.

In all our work for unity there must be constant recognition of the Lordship of Christ. Love of denomination must be subordinated to loyalty to him. The price of enduring union of his followers must ever be complete faith in and obedience to him.

We must maintain fellowship not only with Christ himself but also cultivate more intimate fellowship with his followers of other Christian groups, including those with whom we may have thought we had little in common. Real unity is based on intimate knowledge, confidence and affection, and these are the result of fellowship. Christ left his followers a unity. The apostles did much to perpetuate this unity. Broken unity is, more largely than is generally recognized, the result of broken or neglected fellowship in the deepest things of Christian faith and experience. This lends great significance to the multiplying conferences of members of different Christian communions in recent years—notably, Edinburgh, Stockholm, Lausanne, and Jerusalem,—also the many international Christian student conferences which have done so much to bring into fellowship the future leaders of the churches. I have never forgotten the reply of an eminent archbishop of the Roman Catholic Church in India years ago when I asked him the secret of bringing about real Christian unity: "In the first place, we must pray for it; secondly, courtesy in our relations with one another; and lastly, we must see more of one another."

Confronting together the greatness and overwhelming difficulty of our world mission invariably tends to draw us together. Just as war serves to fuse together the most divergent political parties, so coming to close grapple with the age-long enemies of mankind which threaten the very existence of the Christian Church, for example, world-wide secularism, and destructive anti-Christian communism, cannot but result in deepening the sense of our essential unity. There is nothing quite like undertaking great tasks together. It is significant that the number of projects which Christians of different denominational bodies have grappled with together during the last three decades has been multiplying at an almost geometrical rate. There yet remains a large list of problems which cannot be conquered until the Christians of all groupings near and far, unite more fully in thinking, planning and action. Among them are the economic problems, the opium curse, the white slave traffic, the drink evil, the uncensored cinema, race relationships, war, disarmament. Working together on such issues as these generates an atmosphere of understanding and confidence and makes it easier to discover and then manifest a deeper spiritual solidarity.

To realize such unity in Christ and the organic and visible exemplifications of it before the world requires on our part the exercise of larger faith or trust. Let us trust our unerring guiding principles, such as: We are members one of another; the Lordship of Christ our common Lord; the golden rule; he who would be greatest among you shall be the servant of all. I repeat, these principles are unerring. They never lead into blind alleys. Trusting and, therefore, following them in this matter of unity will without shadow of doubt usher us into ever and ever deeper sense and exhibition of our oneness. This involves also faith in our divine Lord. He will not fail. Nothing has happened in these recent years of upheaval, confusion, and uncertainty to invalidate a single claim which Christ ever made. Faith in Christ necessitates faith in one another. To fail at this point is to doubt his ability. And, as in the case of his trust in men, so with us they will respond to our trust. This should be our attitude in our negotiations with other Christian bodies not only in the Christian lands but also in the mission field. The hour has come for us of the older churches of Europe and America to show great acts of trust in our relations with the younger indigenous churches of Asia, Africa and Latin America. I would not disguise the fact that this involves changes in current policies, likewise the incurring of real risks; but I am equally sure that this is in line with the challenge of Christ.

It is the aspect of difficulty and adventure attending this great undertaking of the drawing together of the true Christians of every name which lends to the whole subject its greatest attraction and glory. It is indeed a summons to the impossible. I would not have it otherwise. It is the very impossibility of the undertaking which constitutes our largest hope. To Christians the impossible is easier than the possible. In the first place, because it calls out the imagination, that faculty in each of us which is least exercised. Moreover, it is the overwhelming situation which liberates our other

latent energies. But chiefly it is the attempting of the impossible which drives, or better draws, us to God, deepens our acquaintance with him, and his ways, and leads to ever fresh manifestations of his super-human wisdom, love and power.

After all the realization and manifestation of Christian unity is a super-human undertaking and achievement. It is not in man to accomplish it. But God wills it. Otherwise the high priestly prayer of our Lord that we all may be one is inexplicable. The most striking thing about this experience is not so much the fact of the prayer for unity, important and essential as that was and is, but the fact that *Christ* prayed for it. If *he* found it necessary or desirable, what presumption and futility it is for us with all our limitations, shortcomings, weakness, and sins to assume that we can bring about the great God-appointed purpose without this practice.

The Christian unity which Christ desires to see and for which this Conference stands requires human personalities dedicated to this high end. May there be raised up worthy successors to Bishop Brent, Robert Gardiner, Archbishop Söderblom, Bishop Bashford and K. T. Paul! May he spare and continue to work mightily through such men as Peter Ainslie and Sir Henry Lunn who are to-day affording such helpful leadership in this great cause! May God himself multiply across the breadth of Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Eastern Orthodox Christendom the number of true apostles of reconciliation—men and women of catholic mind, irenic spirit, reverential regard for God's dealings with his Church in the past and to-day, the power of vision, real creative and constructive ability, humility, unselfish love, courage, undiscourageable enthusiasm, and above all, passionate desire to realize the wish of our Lord Jesus Christ!

THE CLEVELAND COMMITTEE ON INVITATION TO THE CONFERENCE

Charles E. Adams

Elbert H. Baker

Hon. Newton D. Baker

Mrs. Stanlee T. Bates

Rev. Philip Smead Bird

Rev. Ferdinand Q. Blanchard

Dudley S. Blossom

Rev. Dan F. Bradley

Rev. Walter R. Breed

President Kenneth I. Brown
Hiram, Ohio

Rev. Russell Brown

Rev. Raymond C. Burns

Willard M. Clapp

Claude E. Clarke

Rev. Arthur J. Culler

Dr. Elliott C. Cutler

Dr. Linda A. Eastman

A. C. Ernst

G. Leonard Fels

Rev. Frank Halliday Ferris

Prof. G. Walter Fiske
Oberlin, Ohio

D. W. Frackleton

Rev. Andrew S. Gill

Rev. J. H. Goldner

Rev. Thomas Wesley Graham
Oberlin, Ohio

Joseph P. Harris

Headmaster Joel B. Hayden
Hudson, Ohio

Miss Mabel Head

Rev. Adelbert P. Higley

Hon. William R. Hopkins

Miss Jane E. Hunter

Rev. Frank Jennings

A. G. Knebel

Rev. Miles H. Krumbine

Headmistress Edna F. Lake

Rev. G. LeRoy Lawther

Rev. William H. Leach

Rev. Dilworth Lupton

Rev. Robert W. Mark

Hon. John O. Marshall

William G. Mather

Rev. C. Jeffares McComb

Dr. Thomas S. McWilliams

Daniel E. Morgan

Rev. Victor Obenhaus

Ven. Gerard F. Patterson

Headmaster Harry A. Peters

Rev. Harold C. Phillips

Henry F. Pope

Mrs. Francis F. Prentiss

C. H. Prescott

Headmistress Mary E. Raymond

Rt. Rev. Warren L. Rogers

Miss Prudence Sherwin

President Albert B. Storms
Berea, Ohio

Amrose Swasey

David W. Teachout

Dr. Charles F. Thwing

Rev. Don D. Tullis

President Robert E. Vinson

Rev. Ralph Walker

O. M. Walton

Judge Carl V. Weygandt

Dean Francis S. White

Pres. William E. Wickenden

President Ernest H. Wilkins
Oberlin, Ohio

Rev. James D. Williamson

President Charles F. Wishart
Wooster, Ohio

Rev. Louis C. Wright

The next conference of the Christian Unity League will be held in St. Louis, St. John's Methodist Episcopal church, South, May 3-5, 1932.

It will deal with the seven definite and concrete items mentioned in the Cleveland report of the Commission on the United Church of the United States.

All followers of Jesus who are sympathetic toward the principles of the Christian Unity League are invited to come and share in its discussions.

For particulars address:

THE CHRISTIAN UNITY LEAGUE
230 N. Fulton Ave. Baltimore, Md.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
JANUARY, 1932

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK

A LARGE part of this number of *The Christian Union Quarterly* is given over to the Christian Unity League. Its Cleveland Conference registered well. The celebration of the Lord's supper was beautiful and interpretative. The reports of the commissions set a standard for thinking that has already called forth expressions of interest and approval. The evening addresses left in the minds of all a deepening desire for a brotherhood that shall rise above denominational barriers.

The denominational system has broken down Christianity as the economic system has broken down material prosperity. Everything is in chaos. There is a moral disappointment the world over. Democracy, economics, and churches have all broken down. There is not a denomination, in its separate capacity, Catholic or Protestant, on the face of the earth to-day that has a cure for the world's ills. They have all tried it in working alone and they have brought disappointment and ruin.

Christians have got to find brotherhood. Catholics will never win Protestants nor will Protestants win Catholics into their church memberships; Episcopalians will never win Presbyterians nor will Methodists win Baptists. Every now and then, for various reasons, but for no fundamental reason, persons pass from one of these denominations to the other. If the person making

the change is a preacher it is published in all the papers of that denomination as though it were a great victory and that others will follow. There are on our desk now five denominational papers making such announcements. There is not much in it. It has not the first element of victory in it.

The fact is that the denominations are here and no one denomination is swallowing up the others to amount to anything. In all this scuffle Jesus is a small factor. The time is here and now when Jesus must be the dominating factor. That means bridge building from one denomination to the other; it means a new standard of decency among Christians; it means the dawn of brotherhood among the followers of Jesus. All our talk about the divine sonship of Jesus is small talk so long as we do not practice love toward the followers of Jesus. It is a very easy thing to put Christianity up in the heavens, but God sent Jesus to keep it down here on the earth.

Brotherhood among Christians is the greatest need of these times. If it does not come in the next few decades it is far more disastrous to the spiritual needs of the world than the results of the Geneva disarmament conference are to the moral needs of the world. Armaments must be reduced for the peace of the world, but brotherhood must be increased for the salvation of mankind. The denominations have got to make way for Jesus. So long as they close the door in the face of one of Jesus' disciples because that disciple does not agree in every particular with that denomination's tenet, that denomination closes its door in the face of Jesus. It is, likewise, so in the Lord's supper. If one of Jesus' dis-

ciples is forbidden to partake of the Lord's supper because he is not a member of that denomination, it is the same as forbidding Jesus to sit at his own table. But we have done these things so long that somehow we come to think there is something sacred about it. Not one bit of sacredness in it! There is a lot of conceit and self-will and arrogance in it, but no sacredness at all.

Brotherhood among Christians must find its way by constant adventures in the meekness and simplicity of Jesus toward every follower of Jesus. Denominational prohibitions cannot be respected. But the life and love of Jesus must be respected. It is a controversy between the pride of man and the humility of Jesus. He is on trial again in the house of his friends. Whoever would follow him must love every other follower of his so that each can be a brother to the other, and seal their brotherhood by a sense of equality before God, which shall manifest itself in church membership and celebration of the Lord's supper together. These things are the beginnings toward Christian unity; after these things come we have a long way to go before we can have a united Christendom, but until these things come we are playing at the problem of Christian brotherhood.

The Christian Unity League is not a radical movement. Perhaps it might be better if it were. It is moving cautiously but persistently toward a real end. It knows where it is going and it is not going to be satisfied until it gets there. Judging by letters from persons in all denominations that come into this office, if a popular vote were taken among all denominations on the issue

of the equality of all Christians before God, the Christian Unity League would carry by an overwhelming majority. Yet when we come to working at the principle a hundred barriers are set up as though the principle were not practicable. Jesus' way of life is the only practical course. It is his church, we are his people, therefore we should be brethren whether we call ourselves Disciples or Methodists, or Two-seed in the Spirit Predestinarian Baptists — a highway across the whole Christian world, where every follower of Jesus would be free to find fellowship and brotherhood.

At the Cleveland Conference one of the attendants remarked in a private conversation, "You see, we have a conscience." A conscience! Where did we get it? If that conscience indicates prejudice against another body of Christians we certainly did not get it from the Lord, any more than when a person shows prejudice against another race. Jesus is a brother and whether we be Presbyterians or Baptists or Episcopalians or Disciples it is the same Jesus. There is a denominational conscience. Perfectly true. But it is that conscience that must be brought into the light of Jesus. It is not radical to ask for a revision of conscience. Everything with which we have to do is subject to revision in order to find our adjustment to the brotherhood of Jesus. That means going a long way from where we are. But when Jesus is taken seriously we will leave some of our luggage behind, in consequence of which we will be able to travel faster and find in practice that which we have held in theory, which is that Jesus is the living teacher and every one of us who follows him is a brother to all the other brethren.

CHURCH UNITY THROUGH CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

By Rev. Alfred Nevin Sayres
Minister St. John's Reformed church, Lansdale, Pennsylvania

SINCE the rather recent discovery by the Christian churches that unity is a thing to be desired, the ideal of a united Christendom has been approached by a number of different paths. Some have tried to travel the direct, but steep and stony path to unity by way of the merger of denominations. That is to say, they have gone out for union on its own merits and for its own sake.

Others have taken roundabout paths that lead to unity, sometimes purposely and sometimes unwittingly serving the cause of Christian unity. The various churches have been brought together in joint missionary enterprises, united evangelistic efforts, programs of social service and Christian education projects. In these instances unity has been a by-product achieved by the indirect method rather than pursued for its own sake. Perhaps this is the most effective way to achieve unity. When we say to one another, "Go to; let us get together; we are all Christians," we put ourselves in a mood for making comparisons and noting differences. When we look away from ourselves and consider objectively a mutual undertaking which challenges our combined interest and effort, we get together and are scarcely conscious of it.

The achievements in Christian unity that have been realized in the realm of Christian education are worth noticing. They reveal how effectively we can be united in this great enterprise. Let us notice first the development of this united movement in local areas, and then its larger and, perhaps, more significant aspect, the coöperative educational work of the denominations (although this is not the chronological order of development).

When the Vacation School movement took hold of the Protestant churches and spread all over the country, it captivated the imagination of many pastors and Sunday-school superintendents who could not establish such summer schools in their own churches. In thousands of such communities they conceived the idea of pooling their resources — buildings, teachers and funds — and coöperating in community schools. Pastors who had heretofore met only in friendly ministerial gatherings and discussed safe and innocent topics now got together in real enterprises that revealed to them great common interests they had not previously suspected.

When the Vacation School was followed by the winter Week-day School, the same sort of thing happened over and over again. The churches unitedly approached the public schools to arrange for the dismissal of pupils to the various churches and community schools of religion were conducted on a coöperative basis. Pupils were often grouped on the basis of grades irrespective of denominational affiliation and church buildings were selected with a view to their convenient location and their physical equipment without regard to denomination.

In these local educational enterprises undertaken with an honest and friendly approach to their mutual problems, many urban, village and rural churches all over the land discovered that they had much more in common than they had to separate one from the other. At least they had plenty to unite upon and they found a common ground of curriculum and method on which to join in the important project of enlarging the scope of educating children in the Christian religion.

Meanwhile the coöperative movement was on foot between the educational boards of the denominations. In fact a very significant first step toward union was taken as early as 1872, namely, the adoption of the uniform lesson plan by the International Sunday-school Convention. Although this was the venture of a laymen's organization, not officially representing the denominations as such, the uniform lessons gradually bound the various denominations into a unity of thought and Bible study which we are not apt fully to appreciate in this present day, since much further steps have been taken.

As intimated above, the International Sunday-school Association was a laymen's organization, tied but loosely to the denominations, but the latter were somewhat more intimately associated in the consultative body known as the Sunday-school Council of Evangelical Denominations. There were also some few smaller groups of denominations united in the publishing of periodical magazines, lesson courses, and so on. But the really great coöperative step in the educational sphere came with the organization of the International Council of Religious Education, accomplished by the merger

of the two bodies mentioned above. This took place at the Kansas City Convention of the International Sunday-school Association in 1922, and since that time the religious education movement has been developing increasing unity and coherence with each passing year.

The forward steps that have been taken and the actual advances that have been in this realm are positively amazing, when one considers the short time during which the International Council has been in existence. During these ten years or less a great cooperative organization has been set up which officially represents the forty-three denominations affiliated with the Council, and the machinery is oiled and running. A lot of quarry work has been done, getting together the building materials for a new educational temple and forging tools for its erection. These tools and materials are being catalogued and put into usable form for the churches.

One needs only to give the imagination a little free play and visualize the hundreds of conferences of departmental specialists and various executives to realize the amount of church unity that has been practiced.

This movement for unified activity comes to its fullest realization in the projected field promotion plan, designed to distribute the methods and curricula which the Council has been preparing among the churches on the field. At the Council meeting last February a committee on field promotion was constituted with H. C. Munro in charge. This committee is endeavoring to unify the work of the denominations and the Council in areas comprised by the states, and subsequently will do the same in smaller areas.

In New Jersey, for example, the State Council staff includes a number of leaders whose salaries are paid outright by their denominations. They plan and carry through the state program under the guidance of a state secretary paid by voluntary gifts. The weaker denominations, while unable to support full-time members of this staff, contribute to a fund which pays the salaries of other needed workers.

For another example, Pennsylvania has what is called a "united staff," consisting of the state staff and the denominational leaders who are responsible for field promotion in the state of Pennsylvania. This united staff is organizing to plan and administer the program of religious education for Pennsylvania, and some day there will be one unified program promoted in the state, built by the denominations coöperating in the State Council.

In smaller areas, likewise, efforts are being made to correlate and unify the program of the County Councils with the programs of the classes, conferences, presbyteries and other denominational groupings. In all this business from top to bottom we find interdenominational curriculum committees, leadership training groups, departmental specialists and the like working together in such a coöperative spirit that denominational affiliation is forgotten or neglected.

Here is a case that indicates how the wind is blowing in the work of the International Council. The director of leadership training in the writer's own denomination has been closely affiliated with the same sort of work in the Council. He has worked intimately in committee and conference with the Council's director of leadership training. The writer in casual conversation

one day asked Mr. Wentzel, the director in his own denomination, the denominational affiliation of Mr. Knapp, the director for the Council. *He did not know!*

The significance of these conditions in the field of Christian education for the cause of church unity in the coming generation must be apparent. As this coöperative spirit filters down through state conventions and county and district conferences and through *The International Journal of Religious Education* (the Council's organ) into the consciousness of teachers and officers and leaders in the local church schools of the land, the growing generation will arrive at the threshold of maturity with a different mind toward denominationalism from that of their parents and grandparents. As the decades come and go, denominational loyalty will yield to indifference to denominational divisions and this in turn will yield to impatience with such barriers and impatience will finally give way to a determination to be done forever with the things that divide Christians into separate camps and to cultivate a new sense of Christian solidarity.

More power to the International Council of Religious Education! There are other agencies at work in the field of Christian education, but this is the one that binds the denominations in a working unity and that bespeaks a happier and more far-reaching unity at least for Protestant Christianity in the generation ahead of us.

ALFRED NEVIN SAYRES.

THE JEWS AND CHRISTIANS*

By HERBERT L. WILLETT, PH.D.
Author of *The Bible Through the Centuries,* etc.

OF no other race is the world so conscious as of the Jews. They are the universal people, found in almost every land, and marked by characteristics which draw the attention of those among whom they live. These are sometimes marks of a physical type, but more frequently mannerisms and forms of speech. There are other racial groups which are more distinctively recognized in certain parts of the world, and in a measure set apart either by popular approval or dislike, as in the case of orientals on the Pacific coast, or Negroes in portions of the United States, or the nationals of any country that has been the victim of war prejudice, like the Japanese in China, the Americans in Europe in the days of the Spanish War, or the Germans in any of the allied lands.

But the Jew is recognized wherever he goes. This recognition is sometimes friendly and sometimes hostile, but it tends to be universal. In some instances the Jew is proud of the place he holds in the world's regard, whether it is that of approval or of dislike, and sometimes he is deeply sensitive to the sentiment of aversion which many of his people excite. In the latter instances he may attempt to hide his racial status by change of

* Final chapter in the forthcoming volume *The Jews Through the Centuries,* by Dr. Herbert L. Willett from the press of Willett, Clark & Company, 440 S. Dearborn St., Chicago; price $2.50.

name or by taking refuge in non-Jewish groups into which he is able to gain admission, or he may be indifferent to other than Jewish opinion, finding ample compensation in the consciousness of his history and culture, and the importance of the place he holds in the life of the world. Whatever else may be true of the Jews, they are the universal race, found in all lands and represented in nearly all the vocations and avocations of humanity.

Of certain claims often made in reference to them there are no proofs, and intelligent Jews are increasingly aware of the fact. The first is the assumption of the Hebraic origin of the Jews; another is that of their racial purity. The Jew has made himself and the world believe in his derivation from the Hebrew stock, in the fact that biblical references are made to his future restoration to Palestine, and in the purity and integrity of his blood inheritance. In these claims he has been supported by uncritical and sentimental Christian opinion. For none of them is there a basis of fact. Yet in regard to these assumptions the Jew has nothing to regret. His descent from the late and decadent Hebrew life of Judah in the fifth century before the present era would have been nothing to his credit, and indeed would have proved a handicap. There are no biblical texts which refer to the present or future generation of Jews, or their political prospects.

And as for purity of blood, no scholar, Jewish or other, would affirm that either at the beginning of the Jewish state or at any time since has the race been of unmixed stock. In fact one of the chief elements of its vigor and genius has been the constant intermixture of

many strains in its life. Most races which have had any degree of world contact have revealed the same elements of mingled racial elements — Egyptians, Hebrews, Hindus, Greeks, Romans, Europeans of most groups, and most of all, Americans. But none compare with the Jews, whose life has been cast in many lands, and has been subjected to every form of racial misadventure and oppression. That their survival has been possible is one of the miracles of history. The entire story of the Jew has been one of suffering and heroism which merits the admiration and good will of mankind, and above all other groups, of Christians. The words of Frederick Hosmer's noble hymn may well be paraphrased in reference to the Jew:

> "For thee the fathers suffered, for thee they toiled and prayed;
> Upon thy holy altar their willing lives they laid;
> Thou hast no common birthright, great memories on thee shine;
> The blood of all the nations commingled flows in thine."

As Felix Adler, himself a Jew, has rightly said, the high-bred members of the race reveal "noble qualities in versatility of thought, brilliancy of imagination, flashing humor, in what the French call *esprit;* in powerful lyrical outpourings, in impassioned eloquence, in the power of experiencing and uttering profound emotions." In these and many other characteristics of high order the Jew shows himself to be a member of a universal race.

The Jewish claims referred to — those of Hebrew origin, of biblical predictive status, and of purity of stock — are of no particular importance so far as world opinion is concerned. Their factual or fictional nature is merely a matter of historical and scientific inquiry. No one has any controversy with those Jews who find

satisfaction in such claims. It is on wholly different ground that their significance and value as a people rest, and these grounds of culture, industry, morality and religion afford them the right to an ample place in the appreciation and good will of mankind.

Jews reveal the traits both physical and mental of almost every people and culture. Scattered widely as they have been for centuries, they have absorbed many of the characteristics of those among whom they have lived. Held together in a remarkable relationship by group loyalty, by historic traditions and by differing degrees of religious fidelity, they have naturally imbibed many of the elements of their local environments, such as language, national or regional patterns of thinking and behavior, vocational and trade characteristics. Through all variations of distribution, culture and experience they maintain everywhere certain remarkable resemblances which are distinguishing and often unmistakable. These are not necessarily facial. It is often affirmed that one can tell a Jew on sight. This is of course an exaggeration. There are many Jews who show not the slightest trace of racial peculiarity. Nor is it possible to identify Jews by any specific features, such as noses, eyes, hair, facial contour, complexion or other tokens. In many instances one or more of these marks may be present. In many others no one of them is observed. And yet the racial signs are unmistakable. No physiognomist has ever been able to point out the definite and invariable fashion of a Jewish face. Yet in most instances they are not difficult of identification. It would seem that this racial resemblance is less a quality of physical pattern than of manner, speech and disposition, variable as these may be. As in the case of other

races they tend to disappear by contact and absorption with other groups.

If there are distinct differences between Jews and the people of other racial strains, not less marked are the variations among themselves. These differences are of every sort, physiological, regional, social, economic, educational, religious. The Sephardic Jew in Europe has held a certain level of aristocracy. In America he has been the poorest and the least fortunate of his people. The Jew of the Askenazim group on the other hand has belonged to the lower stratum of population in Europe, but by his energy and thrift has prospered in the United States. And between the two groups on either continent there has been little affection. In fact there is no prejudice more intense than that which is exhibited by certain groups of Jews toward other Jews, such as that felt by German Jews toward those of eastern Europe, or that displayed by many Orthodox Jews toward those of modernist views, or that of the radical Zionists toward those of the race who are indifferent to that adventure. In some cases this results from an inferiority complex; in others it is the issue of deep-going differences in conviction.

Jews are of many sorts, some of them well-bred, cultured and pleasing in manners, and others ignorant, rude, arrogant and disagreeable. Many of the latter class hardly realize how unfavorable is the impression they make. It is fortunate that in a free social order like that of the United States a man may rise from the ghetto to a boulevard in a single generation. But even this change does not always involve the disappearance of his ghetto characteristics. Too often he retains unconsciously the peculiarities of the immigrant — language, man-

ners and modes of thinking. Unfortunately, it is those who are most objectionable in their manners who attract attention and create an unfavorable opinion regarding the race in general. In this respect they are like some types of Americans traveling in Europe. As one of them writes, "certain tendencies among the uneducated and illiterate give rise to unlovely and unpleasant idiosyncrasies, a certain restlessness, loudness of manner, fondness of display, a lack of dignity, reserve, repose. And since one loud person attracts greater attention than twenty who are modest and refined, it has come about that the whole race is often condemned because of the follies of some of the coarsest and least representative of its members."

One recalls many varieties of Jews, as different one from another as though they belonged to different races. There are the typical Jews of the Whitechapel Road section of London. There are the crowds of noisy and gesticulating Jews from the East Side, who pour out from clothing factories in side streets into Fifth Avenue at the noon-hour and fill all that section of New York with their clamor. There are those who constitute the ghetto types of Philadelphia, Boston, Cincinnati and St. Louis, and whose market areas seem like bits of busy life transported from Frankfort, Vienna or Moscow. There is the Chicago Jewry in the old Maxwell Street district, now moving gradually into North Lawndale. There are the loud-voiced commercial Jews one sees in the smoking compartments of Pullman coaches, whose conversation deals only in sums running into the millions, even if there is the suspicion that a hundred dollars would tax their resources. There are the aggressive, pushful Jews,

whose chief ambition appears to be to invade residence sections and hotels where they are unwelcome, and who will adopt any means, however dishonest or offensive, to accomplish their object. There is the Jew whose aggressive qualities have made him the master of wide reaches of the industrial and commercial world. Arriving in the steerage, he found a place as janitor in a New York structure, and his growing family did sweatshop work for a clothing firm. In a few years he had become the possessor of the building, and of several adjacent buildings. To-day his children and those of other Jews are the masters of whole sections of the business of the United States — the clothing trade, the department stores, the theatrical business, the moving picture industry and a score of other enterprises, to say nothing of a majority share in the teaching activity of the public schools of several cities, and in some places even the invasion of the police force, in which the Irish have been supposed to hold a monopoly.

On the other hand, the Jew of the educated type, whether in business or the professions, exhibits an order of culture and refinement which makes him a valuable citizen and a delightful companion. The Jewish rabbis are on the average superior in educational equipment and in continuing scholarship to any other class of religious leaders, Protestant or Catholic. The philanthropies of high-minded Jews, not only in behalf of their own people but in the interest of all good causes — educational, civic, benevolent, religious — have given them a place of esteem in the regard of the citizenship of Europe and America.

Probably in no field are the ambition and persistence

of Jews more in evidence than in that of education. In every grade of school from the primary to the university Jewish boys and girls, encouraged by ambitious parents, are eager seekers for entrance and earnest in their pursuit of excellence. In fact this has become the cause of alarm on the part of college and university officials. The popular prejudice against the Jew has subjected him to every form of repression in his quest for education. To keep down the percentage of Jewish students without appearing to do so has exercised the ingenuity of many presidents, deans and faculties. It is a process never quite successful, because Jewish students are among the most alert and insistent to be found in educational institutions of all grades, and their determination to secure the advantages of such discipline is not to be defeated by hardship or racial discrimination.

A Jewish youth has to face exclusion from the usual fraternity life of the campus. His only resort is the creation of fraternities of his own race.[1] In many other regards he is conscious of exclusion. This tends naturally to the establishment of a Jewish *bloc,* whose members stand together in such interests as enlist their activity. If they gain the reputation of clannishness, as is often the case, it is less the result of their preference than of the treatment they receive from their non-Jewish fellow students. It is probable that the Jewish members of college and university groups are often less popular than others because as a rule they are industrious and intelligent. They have a single purpose in their work, and are

1. These associations are both of the secular fraternity type and of religious character. The B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation has established Jewish student centers in connection with the Universities of Illinois, Wisconsin, Ohio, Michigan, California, West Virginia and Texas, and at Cornell University.

not so likely to be diverted from the main object by other interests, social and athletic. The average student too frequently dislikes to allow his studies to interfere with his college work. The Jewish boy has little of that kind of prejudice. It is not too much to say that Jewish students by their hard study and industry have had a measurable influence in raising the standards for admission and graduation in American schools.

If Jews are characterized by marked variations in type, in vocation, in culture and in manners, not less do they differ in religious alignment. Judaism presents three strikingly different groups — the Orthodox, the Reform or Liberal, and the Zionist. These are not wholly separated, or necessarily distinct in all regards. There are, for example, Zionists in both the Orthodox and the Liberal sections. And all three have gradations of commitment which amount almost to group divisions.

The Orthodox section includes those Jews who have come more immediately from the ghetto populations of Europe or who have retained more fully on American soil the habits and thinking of European Jewry. Among those of them who remain faithful to their religion the synagogue service is maintained with devoted loyalty to the conservative traditions of Judaism. The sacred rolls of the Torah and the remaining books of the scripture are held in the same veneration in their chests as are the consecrated elements of the eucharist in the Roman Catholic Church. The sacred days of the calendar are kept both in the homes and synagogue. The Shema is repeated as a duty and privilege.[2] The Passover, Rosh

2. The *Shema* ("Hear, O Israel") is the beautiful passage in Deut. 6:4-9, which is a fitting confession of faith.

ha-Shana, the Day of Atonement and the other feasts and fasts are times of solemn observance with fitting garments and behavior. The synagogue is the community center of the local group with much of the same sanctity it possessed in the middle ages, when it was both a place of worship and a refuge. The rules of conduct prescribed in the *Shulchan Aruch* are observed with much greater fidelity than in more liberal circles. The reading of the Old Testament is a feature of family life, and the study of the Talmud is more obligatory in rabbinical circles than among Reform Jews.

Naturally in a new world environment and in the modern age the Orthodox Jew finds the problem of loyalty to ancient forms and beliefs increasingly difficult, particularly in the religious experience of his children. Complaint is often heard among them that the younger generation tends to neglect the obligations of the synagogue, and even of the home, and to lapse into paganism. This, of course, is not exclusively a Jewish problem in a scientific and questioning generation. The same tension is felt in Christian circles, both Protestant and Roman Catholic. Among the Jews it is particularly felt in small communities where the group influence is weak. The beliefs of the Orthodox Jew are deep-going and sincere. His is an intense monotheism which resents the Christian assumption of the deity of Jesus as an unwarranted invasion of the divine unity. He is willing to concede the impressive character of Jesus, but not as superior to the Hebrew prophets, whom he insists on identifying with his own race. As to the messianic hope, he has either dismissed it as a vain expectation of the past or holds it as still possible of realization, through

the coming of some great prophet or in the fulfillment of Zionist hopes. But his people have suffered so sorely through the years as the result of Christian misunderstanding and persecution that the memory of Christmas and Easter pogroms in Europe is vivid and ineffaceable, and his contact with Christians is likely to be commercial, formal and reserved. His home and his synagogue are his sanctuaries, where the Sabbath is kept with fidelity, the dietetic tabus of the Torah are observed, and his family and friends are as far as possible his exclusive circle.

Reform or Liberal Judaism exhibits a distinct break with the older order of the Orthodox. The public service of the temple or synagogue is at once more simplified and more beautiful. There is no line of separation between men and women. Part of the worship occurs on the Sabbath and part of it on Sunday. The preaching is less the exposition of scriptural and talmudic texts than the presentation of modern themes, such as Christian ministers find worthful.[3] Liberal Judaism has largely freed itself from the legalism of early and mediæval teachings, and rests back upon the ethical and spiritual ideals of the prophets and the psalmists of Israel. It reveres the Old Testament, and respects the Talmud. It repeats the Shema with devotion. But for the dogmas and rules of the *Shulchan Aruch* it has no use as binding upon conscience or conduct. Its attitude

3. One is often intrigued in attending a Jewish service with the frequent quotations in Hebrew from the Old Testament. It is improbable that any of the members of the congregation, save in rare instances, have any knowledge of Hebrew, and it is unfair to a cultured rabbi to imagine that he is resorting to the device merely for purposes of pedantry or ostentation. There was a time when Christian ministers were much addicted to learned quotations in Hebrew, Greek or Latin, in spite of the fact that such a display of erudition was wholly valueless as a homiletic aid. The wonder is that some rabbis still employ it.

toward the dietetic and other laws of the Torah is free, though not necessarily indifferent. Marriage and divorce are treated as modern social facts, and not as matters of regulation in accordance with rabbinical law. It accepts the common scholarly attitude toward evolution and other scientific truths as disclosed in the discoveries of the age, and the results of critical inquiry in the field of biblical literature. It is not interested in the older Jewish prayers for the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem or the restoration of the sacrificial cultus.

Naturally Liberal Judaism, true to the historic attitude of the synagogue, rejects the Christian doctrines of the trinity, the atonement, and the superior value of the New Testament. But while finding no place in its creed for any type of Christology such as Christianity professes, its attitude toward Jesus is appreciative and reverent. It is conscious that the Jews gave him to the world, and that Judaism has a message regarding his universal values to which the church might well give heed. Its messianic hope centers not in a person nor in Zionistic dreams regarding a repossessed Palestine, as some of its people insist. At its best it is concerned with an aroused and consecrated Judaism possessing a vital and world-wide evangel of justice, peace and brotherhood, a spirit of good will for which the nations wait. Its emphasis is upon God, humanity and the social virtues. It sets its face against all forms of privileges and militarism. In many features Liberal Judaism resembles Unitarianism, in which communion in fact many Jews have found a church home.

But Judaism, both Orthodox and Liberal, has many problems to face to-day. One of its best known in-

terpreters writes of it in these words: "We are going through the throes of theological disintegration. There are many Jews to-day whose loyalty to the synagogue is just as attenuated as the loyalty of thousands of Christians to the church. There are those who continue to support the synagogue for purely sentimental reasons or because they too are not brave enough to break completely, but follow the line of least resistance. Of course, with us there is this great difference: Christendom really at heart would not welcome the Jew, all the efforts at conversion to the contrary notwithstanding. But we Jews are faced with the same problem as our Christian brethren: How shall we rebuild the structure of religious life which is falling about our heads? This is as true of Orthodox Jews as it is of Reform or Liberal Jews. . . . What is the Jew? Is he a race? Is he a denomination such as Protestant or Catholic? Is he a nation in the sense that the French or English are nations? Is he a nationality? What is nationality? Why should the Jew continue to refuse to intermarry? Why should he retain his distinctiveness? What is the 'mission of the Jew'? In what sense, if any, is he a 'chosen people'? What compromises in thinking and conduct will he be called upon and can he make without sacrificing his identity? How can he maintain his integrity and why? Our best critical thought to-day is engaged in examining anew the foundations of our beliefs and our purposes."[4]

Zionists constitute a third section of the race, although, as already stated, their numbers usually belong either among the Orthodox or the Reformed. But to the true Zionist the problem of Palestine is more important

4. Rabbi Morris S. Lazaron, Baltimore, Maryland, in "Unity," June 15, 1931.

than the differences between the two classes among his people, although Zionists differ radically among themselves over the puzzle which Palestine presents.

The world's debt to the Jew in almost every area of activity is too great to be recorded in a paragraph. In literature Jews have held a notable place, such names as Heine and Spinoza suggesting many others. To all the arts Jews have made significant contributions, of which the names of Mendelssohn, Meyerbeer, Offenbach, Goldmark, Rubenstein, Hoffman, Heifetz and Kreisler in the single field of music are a suggestion. Karl Marx is the commanding figure in the domain of socialism. In science Michelson and Einstein are names significant of leadership. In the domain of philanthropy, Nathan Strauss and Julius Rosenwald have been conspicuous, and many other Jews have given evidence of the same spirit. The place of the Jew in the story of America has been important. Santangel the capitalist, De Torres the soldier, Gerson the navigator, Cresques the map-maker and Ibn Ezra the astronomer and mathematician were helpers in Columbus' discovery of the continent. His first letters home were sent in acknowledgment to the Jews Santangel and Sanchez. From that time onward the place and services of Jews in American history have been impressive, and have found frequent recital.

In spite, however, of all the contributions made by the Jew to civilization in America and other parts of the world, he still suffers the results of unfriendly patterns of thought carried over from the middle ages. The fact that Christians degraded the Jews by shutting them away in ghettos, denying them the right to own land, prohibiting them from the pursuit of normal occu-

pations, forcing them to wear garments which were badges of disgrace, persecuting them for being Jews, attempting to force them into baptism, and destroying their sacred books, has left a long and bitter heritage of antagonism which will require time and resolute effort to overcome. It has produced a vicious stereotype in the attitude of most non-Jews toward that unhappy race.

There is discrimination against Jews in employment which makes it difficult for them to secure positions except among their own people. To be known as a Jew is frequently sufficient to shut the doors of clubs or hotels, or to prevent entrance into desirable residence sections, quite regardless of the character or culture of the applicant. It is not strange that escape has been sought in multitudes of cases by change of name, or by the adoption of another faith. Anti-Semitism, although it is a misnomer, continues in America, where it has least excuse for existence. Defamatory uses of the word "Jew" are encountered, as though it were synonymous with "usurer" and "undesirable." Such characterizations are frequently unconscious and not intentionally discourteous, as the Anti-defamation Commission of the B'nai B'rith has revealed. All the more do they disclose the bias of popular speech. The dissemination of anti-Jewish literature is a potent source of ill will. One of the most discreditable journalistic campaigns in the history of the country was maintained for many months against Jews by a wealthy manufacturer, only to collapse at last by its own falsehood and futility. No intelligent Jew is longer offended by the portrait of "Shylock," which as everyone known, is not to be taken seriously as

more than a type in the England of Shakespeare's time, when there were practically no Jews in the land.

Yet the members of that race suffer many disabilities, both economic and social, in Europe and the United States. Even physical violence is not wholly a thing of the past. In Saloniki, where a large proportion of the population is Jewish, a mob attacked and wrecked the offices of the Maccabees society during the summer of 1931 under the impulse of race prejudice. In Berlin, at the festival of Rosh ha-Shana in the autumn of the same year, anti-Jewish riots spread terror and violence in the Jewish quarter. In Cracow, Warsaw, and other Polish university centers, student riots were organized a month later against the Jews because of their refusal to deliver bodies for dissection. Conflicts in which the Jews are the objects of attacks are frequently reported, chiefly in Poland, Roumania, Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Such reports read like the stories of outrages committed in the ghettos of the middle ages.

These and similar events are the result of racial, nationalistic and religious prejudices, as senseless as they are cruel. As Julius Drachsler writes: "They are fundamentally socially conditioned reactions. There are no instinctive prejudices. All are socially created. The only 'instinctive' element is the capacity to develop either in one direction or in the other. The social environment into which a child is born is replete with admonitions, positive and negative, which tend accumulatively to fix attitudes. Think of the complex of influences that relentlessly, steadily bear down on the Polish child with reference to his Jewish neighbors. Thus we begin to get

an idea of this conditioning process that has its source in environment."[5] Children have no such prejudices until they are inoculated with the group hatreds which prevail in their families. Jewish and non-Jewish boys form close and enduring friendships. Unfriendliness toward the Jew is a vicious social neurosis toward an "out group." Such groups are always the objects of suspicion. We believe evil of them. We damage them. We discriminate against them. We keep away from them. One of the tests of a militant and efficient Christianity is its vigorous protest against race prejudice in every form. The next great step in American education ought to be the extension of intelligence and the expansion of the areas of good will by means of which boys and girls of all faiths shall be released from religious and racial prejudice. They will thus be led to coöperate in the building of an ethical and spiritual civilization which can meet and overcome the mechanized and material pattern of life now prevalent. With that type of education there will come a measurable disappearance of racial and religious prejudices.

The closer approach of Christians and Jews to each other is one of the important problems of the present period. It would seem that the ineffective method is that of Christian missions to Jews. With no sentiment but one of good will toward the earnest and sacrificial men and women who are promoting missions among the Jews, it would seem that the greater need of the time is such friendliness on the part of Christians toward Jews as shall result in a coöperative effort for social ends without loss of appreciation of both Jewish and Chris-

5. Bruno Lasker, *Jewish Experiences in America*, p. 92.

tian forms of belief. The best religious service which a Christian can render a Jew is to encourage him in loyalty to his ancestral faith. There is far greater value, both to the individual and to society, in that fidelity to the fundamental elements of religion which are found both in Judaism and Christianity than in the transfer of men and women from the one confession to the other. One is not unmindful of the hope cherished by the apostle Paul that his Jewish brethren might all share the satisfaction which he found in the gospel. It was the misfortune both of Judaism and Christianity that mistakes in the strategy of coöperation at the beginnings of the Christian movement—mistakes on both sides—rendered such hopes as Paul's abortive, and the experience of later centuries widened the breach. That chasm is not to be closed by any process of proselyting, but by growing appreciation each of the other, and by friendly cooperation in congenial tasks. The terms "Christian" and "Jew" should cease to connote two hostile cultures. They have too much in common to warrant such estrangement. These terms ought to stand for the best in the two confessions, as Lessing makes clear in his much-quoted lines, in which he has the Christian monk say to the Jewish Nathan:

> "Heaven bless us;
> That which makes me to you a Christian
> Makes you to me a Jew."

Christians could become much more Christian than they are in their attitude toward Jews, and Jews might also cultivate a more friendly spirit.

Among the methods which are proving of value in the cultivation of good will and the removal of the

tragic reality of prejudice between Jews and Christians is the fostering of friendly relations in gatherings where exchange of opinion and social appreciation can be promoted. Jewish rabbis are being invited to membership in ministerial associations and other conferential groups. No society for biblical research or religious discussion would think of depriving itself of the values derived from the presence and contributions of Jewish scholars.[6] They should be asked to fill Christian pulpits and to give lectures to Christian audiences. Both in culture and courtesy their appearance would be of high value. Such contacts would prove of lasting advantage, and would be appreciated and reciprocated.

In recent months more direct and purposeful relations between Christians and Jews have been promoted under the auspices of the "Committee on Goodwill between Jews and Christians" of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. The purpose of this committee and the conferences held under its direction is "to unite Jews and Christians in Goodwill; and to promote coöperation in behalf of a social order more nearly based on those ideals of justice, fellowship, and peace which are common to the prophetic traditions of Jews and Christians alike." Meetings at which representatives of both faiths have spoken in interpretative and friendly spirit have been held in more than a hundred communities, including several colleges and universities. A significant comment was made by Mr. Edward A. Filene, the well-known Jewish merchant and philanthropist of Boston, to the effect that the most potent

6. An example of friendly coöperation between Christian and Jewish scholars is the recent dedication by Professor G. Bear of his edition of the Mishna Ms. Codex Kaufman, A 50. to the Jerusalem University (JAOS. Mar. 1931, p. 80).

cure for anti-Semitism would be the support of the social service program of the Federal Council of Churches by American Jews. There are Jewish journals such as *The American Hebrew* which might be read to advantage by members of the Christian community, just as there are scholarly volumes produced by Jewish writers which are welcomed both in Jewish and non-Jewish circles.

The attitude which gives the best promise of friendliness and mutual appreciation on the part both of Jews and Christians is a resolute determination to forget the mistakes and sins of the past and to cultivate a new spirit of good will. The Christian is humbled by the memory of a past which is dark with hatred, cruelty and prejudice toward the Jew. But there is no virtue in mere sentimental regrets. The immeasurable contributions made by the Jew to civilization, morality and religion place the church under obligation to join forces with the synagogue in the effort to bring in the era of brotherhood and peace for which the world waits. On the other hand, the Jew needs to avoid morbid and self-pitying complacency over his unhappy past, and taking advantage of the immense political and social releases which have come to him in western Europe and the United States, to set himself afresh to the high tasks of caring for the poor and unfortunate of his own race, and of meeting purposefully the opportunities and obligations for cultural, ethical and spiritual leadership for which his training and experience have prepared him.

His duty is not alone to his own people, definite and essential as that may be. It is to an entire needy and perplexed humanity that the message of Jewish faith and

courage ought to come. The word spoken by the Hebrew prophet to his people long ago might well come to leaderlike Jews to-day: "It is too slight a thing for your being my servant merely to raise up the tribes of Jacob and restore the survivors of Israel. I will make you a light of the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth."[7] On Jew and Christian alike rests the obligation which both have inherited from the prophetic past to mediate light and direction not to a single race but to all mankind. As long as the Jewish community produces modern prophets of the type of Abba Hillel Silver, Louis L. Mann, Rudolph I. Coffee, Stephen S. Wise, Harry Levi and others in a long list of distinguished rabbis and teachers, its obligation, like that of the Christian church, is clear and emphatic. Its messianic hope lies not in a single age or locality, but in a community consecrated to the good life and to world peace. The Zion of its dreams is not in Palestine but in all the lands of Jewish habitation. Its language is no one dialect, however historic or sacred, but the universal language of all the nations among whom it lives.

And in the fuller attainment of such a world mission, the Jew may well come as many of his people have already come, to a truer appreciation of Jesus and a more positive attitude toward him. As long as he was interpreted under a trinitarian formula, the strict monotheism of Jews was shocked and repelled. With the passing of that conception of deity, a new door opens to Jewish and Christian fellowship, and to a recognition of Jesus as the chief contribution of Jewish life to the world, the prophet and teacher whose words hang in the

7. Isa. 49:6.

air like banners, and whose sentences walk through all the earth like spirits. The most distinguished rabbi and teacher in the Chicago of the last generation spoke habitually of Jesus as "the Savior." It was a term of reverence, even of affection, and carried no implication of dogmatic Christian beliefs. But it made easier the contacts between Christian and Jew. No Christian need surrender anything of his faith in the supreme redemptive ministry of the Man of Nazareth, nor need the Jew abdicate his position of firm and uncompromising monotheism. But there is ample ground for fellowship within the wide circle of Jesus' life and ideals, and each should be able to abate, under the spell of his personality and all-embracing love, the misunderstandings and estrangements of the past. The Jew will not become a Christian, at least not until the Christian is more worthy of the name he bears. But in the broad area of biblical ideals, where Jesus the Jew remains, as all would confess, the central figure of history, there is room for a fellowship of faith and service in which Christians and Jews of every order may happily join.

What is the future of the Jews as a race? With the removal of economic barriers, and the attainment of freedom in all the western world, will it not be increasingly difficult for them to remain a separate and coherent group? Will the desire to mingle with the non-Jewish world in social life, in scholarly pursuits and in the promotion of better citizenship and morality prove too strong for the habit of racial segregation? Has the Jew survived thus far as a separate type chiefly by reason of pressure and persecution from without? And when that pressure is removed, as it is gradually disappearing,

and the Jews are welcomed increasingly into the wider circles of the social order, what can prevent their absorption and disappearance, a fate which has overtaken so many racial units in the past? The tendency is obvious. The numbers of Jews who have merged with other peoples is vastly greater than the total company that remains. The two strongest factors in their racial persistence have been their loyalty to the Torah and the centripetal effect of persecution. Both these factors are losing their force to-day. Will such facts imperil to a serious degree the integrity and persistence of Jewish life? The answers are various, and none of them is conclusive. But whatever the individual opinion may be, it is certain that the Jew who has survived so many mutations of fortune in the past will remain an important element in the life of humanity for a long time to come, and that his place in the history of world affairs, of culture and of religion will be determined far less by outward influences, such as have shaped his career to so large a degree in the centuries gone by, than by the courageous and determined attitude of the leaders of his own race on whom so high a degree of opportunity and obligation has fallen.

HERBERT L .WILLETT.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE PRESENT-DAY SUMMONS TO THE WORLD MISSION OF CHRISTIANITY. By John R. Mott. Nashville: Cokesbury Press; 325 pages; price $2.50.

This is one of the great books of the year. There is no man among us better equipped to look out upon the world situation and to see its cure in the application of Christianity to the world's need than Dr. Mott. For forty years he has been an outstanding leader in the expansion of Christianity. As chairman through the years of the executive committee of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, as organizer and chairman of the World's Student Christian Federation, as general secretary of the Y.M.C.A. work, as organizer and chairman of the two outstanding missionary conferences of the world—Edinburgh in 1910 and Jerusalem in 1928—he is in a position to know both the personnel and movements that are making for a more Christian world.

This book consists of six lectures delivered on the Cole Foundation of the School of Religion of Vanderbilt University. In transcribing them for publication they have been expanded into ten chapters. These deal with world trends and leadership, having to do with rural life, industry, race, and the living message. They are an appeal to share, to serve, and to coöperate, closing with an extended bibliography. Every lecture is characterized by directness and insight with a remarkable understanding of movements, appropriate quotations, striking incidents, and a presentation that is challenging.

It is a book of such quality as will enrich the thinking of Christian workers in enabling them to meet the present-day conditions with confidence. Its message is Christ—an ever-living personality—the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, enlarged in the sense that there are so many more living now than ever before who have had experience of him, and communities, the world over, which have furnished demonstrations of his transforming power in human relations. It is this kind of Gospel that summons us to be adventurous and releases a living message for a larger adaptation of means and methods. Every chapter moves toward those assurances that are so greatly needed in these days of doubt and uncertainty. It is a message of hope.

NATIONAL DEFENSE. A Study of the Origins, Results, and Prevention of War. By Kirby Page, Editor, *The World Tomorrow*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart; 403 pages; price $3.00.

Among the foremost prophets for the abolition of war stands Kirby Page. This is a book of irrefutable data. It is divided into four parts — I. Causes of the World War, II. Results of the World War, III. Existing Perils to World Peace, and IV. A Strategy of National Defense. Growing armaments, economic competition, high tariffs, control of raw material, war debts, discriminatory immigration, demand for room for over-populated countries—all these conditions have set up suspicions and fears and enmities to an alarming degree. The United States postponing ratification of the World Court protocol and at the same time remaining out of the League of Nations, along with Turkey, Russia, and Mexico, makes an awkward situation. Germany threatened with a communist dictatorship, Russia growing feverish for fear of invasion, India seething with revolution, Japan advancing into China, which already is menaced by brigandage and piracy, Franco-Italian relations strained, Jews and Arabs contending for control of Palestine, and a dozen other situations where there is national uneasiness along with racial arrogance and discrimination by Americans and Europeans in Asia and Africa provoking a storm of resentment, present serious conditions the world over. Confronted with such ominous world situation sharpens the issue as to whether the way of solution lies in mass murder or in courts of justice.

This book sets forth clearly, sustained by an abundance of data, that the way out of our entanglements is by the way of a court of justice. Its arguments are strong; its accumulation of evidence is convincing; and its appeal is sound. It is a book of towering force, sustained by elaborate notes and references. There must be built up a machinery for pacific settlement of international disputes. The devices needed are conciliation, arbitration, joint commissions, conferences, judicial settlement, executive bodies, clearing houses for emergency action, and unofficial bodies of coöperation. Rapid strides are being made to organize the world on a peace basis—more in the last dozen years than in the preceding five centuries. All these contributions are presented in this volume. It closes with a twenty-two point program for patriots as follows: (1) Seek clearer understanding and keener appreciation of the peoples of other lands; (2) Urge the adoption of text-books which promote peace rather than war; (3) Advocate the establishment of a national

peace department in the Federal Government; (4) Roll up a tidal wave of public support for the Briand-Kellogg treaty; (5) Support an agreement that in event of the violation of the Briand-Kellogg treaty the signatories of the pact will immediately enter into conference as to the kind of non-warlike action demanded by the crisis; (6) Uphold the effort to negotiate conciliation and arbitration treaties with all other nations; (7) Support the movement to induce our government to sign the optional clause of the World Court protocol; (8) Strive to secure the early entrance of the United States into the League of Nations; (9) Recognize the value of membership in the International Labor organization by the United States; (10) Work for the early independence of the Philippine Islands; (11) Advocate the recognition of Soviet Russia by the United States; (12) Urge the participation of our government in a new conference on reparation and war debts; (13) Reveal the menace of chauvinism; (14) Emphasize the fallacies and perils of the military philosophy; (15) Struggle to secure drastic reduction in armaments; (16) Endeavor to secure the abandonment of armed intervention in other lands; (17) Seek to abolish the R. O. T. C. in public high schools and civilian colleges and universities; (18) Point out the perils inherent in the Citizens' Military Training Camps; (19) Stand like flint against high tariffs; (20) Strive to avoid racial discrimination in our immigration and naturalization laws; (21) Attempt to remedy such acts of international injustice as that perpetrated by saddling Germany with sole guilt in causing the World War; and (22) Go on record as stating your present purpose not to sanction any future war nor participate in warfare as an armed combatant.

QUOTABLE POEMS. Volume two. Compiled by Thomas Curtis Clark. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company; 370 pages; price $2.50.

Here is a collection of more than 500 beautiful poems, selected by one of the foremost poets of our time. They have genuine poetic quality and their quotability makes the volume of immense value. They are poems of adventure, ambition, aspiration, beauty, brotherhood, building, burdens, character, children, church, common things, confidence, courage, content, cross, daily living, and a continuation of such subjects as to make the volume indespensible to those speakers and writers who are seeking to make their approaches by

the fineness of poetic thinking. There is hardly more than half a dozen poems from any author. The range in both subjects and authors in unusually wide, but one would expect that from Thomas Curtis Clark whose taste and poetic quality of thought would gather the best in the field of poetry. It is a beautful book.

ISSA. A Poem. By Robert Norwood, Author of *The Witch of Endor, The Man of Kerioth,* etc. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; 95 pages; price $2.50.

One of the encouragements of these times is the coming of poets. Sixteen years ago Robert Norwood published his first volume of poems. Since then he has given us seven volumes of poetry. Every one who has read *The Man of Kerioth,* which is a drama constructed on the character of Judas Iscariot, will be eager to read *Issa* which is a mystical and spiritual autobiography. There is nothing forced in any line, but the picturesque flashes out like blooming flowers. It is a religious poem and the poet moves in the ever-present consciousness of the immanence of deity, as the best poetry in the world finds its basis here. It is arranged in seven cantos. Here is an instance of beauty in the sixth canto:

"For why should man regret
The silver dawn
Now that the sun has set
And from the lawn
Slow mist arises as of quiet tears
Shed for the swift futility of years?

"Let dawn and dewy eve
Complete the day;
Trust time and dare believe
What went away
Returns the brighter for its very going—
O eastern sky, another dawn is growing! "

How refreshing in this mechanical age to sit at the feet of poets who can write like Robert Norwood and dream of a finer world than the drabness surrounding us would have us think. The poet is essential to vision and spiritual interpretation. Whether as rector of St. Bartholomew's Protestant Episcopal Church, New York, or the author of *Issa,* Robert Norwood is relaxing nerves and helping multitudes to find a larger fellowship in the life of a weary world.

CHORES AND THE ALTAR. A series of Brief Intimate Messages and Affirmative Personal Testimony to the Mystic Faith of the Christian Soul. By George Alexander Campbell, Minister Union Avenue Christian Church, St. Louis. St. Louis: Bethany Press; 242 pages; price $2.00.

If there were nothing more in this book than its less than a hundred topics listed in its table of contents the book would be worth while. Topics like these: "The Creed of the Pastor," "My Mother," "My Father," "The Under-Potter," "The Good, the Bad, the Doubtful," "The Overthrow of the Last Enemy," "Ecclesiastical Courtship," "The Climax of the Speed," "The Fellowship of Pain," and many other equally fascinating topics associated with the author's personal experience. All of the chapters are outlets of his own experience, beautifully written, and challenging. He disclaims any attempt at a treatise on worship or Christian education or plan of organization or an apologetic. Some of all these have crept into it, but its beauty lies in its being the intimate testimony of the mystic faith of the Christian soul and its contention that ministers must give more attention to the altar and less to the debilitating and tyrannical chores of the church. Such a book is needed and most ministers need to face the challenge of it. Many ministers have ruined their work and the work of the church as well by neglecting the altar for chores. But Dr. Campbell sees the possibility of making even chores a means of grace and calls for worship, Christian education, fidelity to the home, and daring ventures in mighty love in the confidence of the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ. It is fully illustrated. Every chapter reads well.

WORD PICTURES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. Volume. IV. By Archibald Thomas Robertson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D. Professor of Interpretation of New Testament Greek, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc.; 634 pages; price $3.50.

This book is dedicated to one of the foremost Bible scholars of the world, Dr. Adolf Deissmann. The author's name is on the title page of more than thirty books. Many of them we have read with profit. This book takes its place among the best, perhaps second only to his *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research.* Whatever Dr. Robertson writes he puts us

under obligation to him. It is always so well done, so scholarly, so spiritual, and so clear. This book is a store house for every student of the writings of Paul, covering all of his epistles. Each verse is made to stand in picturesque style. There is just enough said on each verse to make it a picture in itself—sometimes half a page, other times two or three lines, but always sufficient to open a new road of thinking and to give larger understanding of the mind of Paul. The references are so complete that it is almost an index to a library. It is crowded with the careful work of the scholar and so simplified that every one can share it. It is a most intriguing volume to all lovers of the Bible.

CALVARY TO-DAY. The Words from the Cross to Modern Men and Women. By the Rt. Rev. Charles Fiske, S.T.D., L.H.D., LL.D. Bishop of Central New York. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Company; 105 pages; price $1.00.

These are Good Friday addresses given in Trinity Church, New York. They are informal meditations on the seven words from the Cross. They are simple and practical, abundant in thoughtfulness and spiritual reality. It is a serviceable book in helping one in meditating on those tragic hours in the life of Jesus. Emphasis on the Cross is coming more and more into understanding, especially in these times, and this book will help toward that end.

BODYGUARD UNSEEN. A True Autobiography. By Vincenzo D'Aquila. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc.; 279 pages; price $2.50.

This is a story of a soldier who after enlisting in the army, saw the folly of war and became a pacifist. That has been the experience of many soldiers. It is rather surprising that it is not the experience of all soldiers, unless it is explained in one of the sentences of Frederick the Great when he said, "If men would think they would not enlist in the army." It is the thinking soldier who turns against war as a method of adjusting international disputes. That part of the story is all right, but the protection to some and not to others, by an unseen bodyguard in all dangerous places is artificial. Jesus never promised anything like that to his followers. The path of godly service is one of hardship, all kinds of hardship and frequently ends in death. This issue was largely the subject of Paul's

first letter to the Thessalonians. Some of them believed on becoming Christians that they would be protected from all persecutions and hardships. Finding it not so they left Christ. But Paul wrote them that to these things they were appointed. God does not show favoritism in dealing with his children as this book in some instances would indicate.

CREATIVE CAMPING. A Coeducational Experiment in Personality Development and Social Living. By Joshua Lieberman, Director of Pioneer Youth of America and Its National Experimental Camp, 1924 to 1929. Introduction by Prof. William Heard Kilpatrick. New York: Association Press; 251 pages; price $2.00

As Dr. Kilpatrick remarks in the introduction, "A better education stands forth in clearer light." It is the account of a camp under the Pioneer Youth Movement, itself an outgrowth of the labor movement which has the interest of bringing a better world into being. This camp has only ideals and the passion of its few leaders to start with. Out of it grew a truly democratic experience where respect for personality was balanced with equality of opportunity. The responsibility for creativeness was carried by all concerned. How it was done from simple beginnings is a most thrilling story of adventure in creating a new social order. This book is valuable for help in building a more creative family life as well as for school and community efforts. Camps such as these should be forerunners of that democracy which America has failed in finding.

—MARY AINSLIE.

THE BLUE TEAPOT. Sandy Cove Stories. By Alice Dalgliesh. Illustrated by Hildegard Woodward. New York: The Macmillan Company; 73 pages; price $2.00.

Miss Dalgliesh has written a delightfully simple literal story of a small community known as Sandy Cove. It offers a sympathetic understanding of the ways of living of many of the simple country folk who inhabit small sea towns along our northern coasts. Miss Letty, the yellow haired twins whose names were changed, the seven cats that would not stay given away, Zebedee and his first fishing, Marylee Marie awaiting her Christmas candles are vivid personalities

andfriendlier with each telling. Such approaches to the life of others build up in children that friendliness which need underlie all conduct and later calls for world unity.

—Mary Ainslie.

Can Anglicanism Unite With Rome? By W. H. McClellan, S.J. (American Press, New York.) There are two positions of the Anglicans regarding corporate reunion with Rome. One is that their status is that of an original portion of the Catholic church, suffering from the calamity of schism, but still preserving a structure and source of intrinsic energy derived from Catholic origin. The other is that their church's only normal destiny is its collective reception into Catholic unity, and not the individual restoration of any of its present members. The loss to Anglicanism of Newman, Ward, Dalgairns, and others in 1845 through the Oxford Movement made reunion with Rome a distateful subject for some years. The friendship between Lord Halifax and Abbé Portal raised the question as to whether Anglicans possessed a genuine sacrificing priesthood. The pope appointed a commission to investigate the validity of Anglican orders. The decision was adverse to the Anglicans and later Leo XIII announced that the decision was for all time, fixed, confirmed, irrevocable, closing for all time as to whether Anglicans share in the Christian priesthood. But Father McClellan doubts whether the Anglicans will be able to comprehend it. An account of the rejection of the invitation to the World Conference on Faith and Order is given, reaffirming that Rome had spoken her mind once and need not be expected to speak it again. He sees the rapid disappearance of the principles of the Oxford Movement from Anglican thought and life and cites as evidence the appearance of the commentary on the Bible, a work of more than fifty leading Anglo-Catholic clerics, headed by Bishop Gore. He says, "In this work, by common consent of all co-editors, the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, their consequent freedom from error, and the whole authority of apostolic tradition as a norm of Christian faith, are openly and emphatically denied." He regards Anglican archbishops and bishops as laymen, and "the Anglican church as a thing of human contrivance, human creation, and human support"—not even "an organic remnant of a Catholic past," leaving "no further pretext for anything but individual submission." This is about the same position the Anglicans hold toward the Non-conformists and about the same

position that some Protestants hold toward other Christians, all getting their cue from Rome and Rome getting hers from political Rome. It is a true instance of sectarian arrogance. This recalls the story of Bishop Manning, Protestant Episcopal bishop of New York, who forbade Dr. Coffin, a distinguished Presbyterian minister, whom he regarded as a layman, celebrating the Lord's supper in one of the *loaned* edifices of the New York diocese. All this sectarian arrogance may appear very sacred and solemn to some, some ecclesiastics in particular, but it is a conundrum how a sensible man can read all this without his smile bursting into a laugh. But we must turn from this to a pamphlet on religion.

The Re-emphasis of Personal Religion. By the Rt. Rev. William Scarlett, LL.D., bishop co-adjutor of Missouri (Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Ill.) This is the annual Hale memorial sermon, delivered to young men preparing for the ministry. It is based on Isaiah's vision and is a call to lead people to live nearer to God, to clear the path as far as possible for spiritual experience, and to show people how to find that resource of religion which gives life its deepest meaning, its richest color, its driving incentive. There are endless ethical implications in attaining this end, but our primary purpose is to make people conscious of the Spirit of God moving in their lives, and sensitive and responsive to his presence. He maintains "an inner need of a companionship which no human friendship at times can quite answer—which only God can fully satisfy, whose likeness in some measure we are, whose Spirit is the ground of our being." This is the basis of human experience and the sermon is a noble appeal.

Appeal for Unity. By Daniel Sommer (*Apostalic Review,* Indianapolis). For more than fifty years Mr. Sommer has been interested in Christian unity. In 1883 he started a magazine and proposed to call it *A Call to Unity,* but his associate objected to the name. He has written much on this subject and preached often on it. His special interest lies in harmonizing the divisions in the Disciple denomination, he being a member of that branch of the Disciples that objects to instrumental music in worship. Two of the leading conservatories of music in Europe state that no instrument of any kind is used in connection with voice culture. While we are inclined to think that instrumental music should not be a test of membership, yet we are, likewise, inclined to the judgment that instruments, and

not individuals, are doing too much of the singing in our modern worship, the result being that many people in the congregation do not sing at all. He condemns those who brought division among the Disciples and sees harmony in holding more closely to the Scriptures—"where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent."

The New Psychology, Behaviorism, and Christian Experience. By Arthur E. Main, D.D. (Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y.) Dr. Main sets forth two philosophies of life dealing with God, man, and the world—behaviorism and Christian experience. He does not argue for the soundness of one and the unsoundness of the other, but states the position of both and supports these positions with admirable quotations, leaving the reader to decide which is more reasonable and satisfying. After reading, it will be retained as valuable for reference.

Like All Nations? By J. L. Magnes (Herod's Gate, Jerusalem, Palestine). It is not that the Jews desire to be like other nations in making Palestine their home, but rather to develop in the atmosphere of their ancient home their own life and culture. There are now 900,000 people in Palestine of whom 160,000 are Jews. The author does not favor a Jewish national state nor an Arab national state, but for a bi-national country to put the control in a mandate as nearly permanent as possible held by Great Britain from the League of Nations. He sees that both education and patience must become large factors before much can be accomplished.

Report of the International Congress of Antimilitarist Ministers and Clergymen. (International Union of Antimilitarist Ministers and Clergymen, Amsterdam, Holland.) Out of three days' discussion on the attitude and duty of the churches toward war, strong expressions were given against war, also condemnation of military chaplains as inconsistent with the Gospel of Jesus. The withdrawal of chaplains from the army is one of the steps in the abolition of war.

500 Questions and Answers in Religion. By the Rev. John S. Littell, D.D. (Morehouse Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wis.) The author is the rector of St. Peter's Protestant Episcopal Church, Lewes, Del. Most of the questions and answers have to do with that denomination. All are interesting and well arranged.

PRINTED IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE
HESS PRINTING COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MD.

THE
ST. CHARLES

Occupying Entire Block
On the Boardwalk at New Jersey Avenue

ATLANTIC CITY

A Smart Hotel in
America's Smartest Resort

NO place like Atlantic City to get rid of a cold. A stay at the St. Charles—leading winter resort hotel, with the longest sun deck on the ocean front—is health insurance.

Winter Rates Most Attractive

European or American Plan
French and German Cuisine

VOL. XXI No. 4

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

APRIL 1932

ONE OF THE EARLIEST CHRISTIAN GEMS

CONTENTS

At the Editor's Desk

"This Is My Body" . . . . . ALFRED E. GARVIE

The Crisis Theology and the Ecumenical Movement ADOLPH KELLER

Union in His Name . . . . . JOHN B. COWDEN

Can the Synagogue Claim Jesus? . . . FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN

What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity

Anglicans Discuss Whether Non-conformist Shall Be Allowed to Come to Their Celebration of the Lord's Supper — Eastern Orthodox Holds Mother of God Dogma, But Balks at Papal Supremacy — An Archbishop Asks the Pope for a New Test in Christian Unity — A Protestant Response to the Pope's Invitation — Catholics Refuse Conference Because They Regard Other Christians as Brothers of Annas and Not of Jesus!

Letters to the Editor

Book Reviews

Contents of Volume XXI

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Inc.

BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

AGENTS:

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York

Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka, and Sendai

$2.00 a year 50 cents a copy

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Savior—are parts of the Church of Christ and the recognition of their Equality before God is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and equally free to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ—growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in His own words,—"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another."

CONTENTS

APRIL, 1932

VOL. XXI No. 4

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK 291

"THIS IS MY BODY" ..... ALFRED E. GARVIE 297

THE CRISIS THEOLOGY AND THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT ..... ADOLPH KELLER 305

UNION IN HIS NAME ..... JOHN B. COWDEN 318

CAN THE SYNAGOGUE CLAIM JESUS? ..... FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN 335

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 348

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR 364

BOOK REVIEWS 366

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXI 379

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

Ten Hills, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in January, April, July, and October, is fifty cents a single copy, or two dollars a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion or individual contributing annually $5.00 or more to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY EXTENSION FUND will be entitled to receive three copies of THE QUARTERLY free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copies to some designated persons or institutions.

Entered as second-class matter October 18th, 1923, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A., under the Act of Congress of March 3rd, 1879.

The Christian Union Quarterly

EDITOR

PETER AINSLIE, D.D., Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, JR., D. D., Rector St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

DR. HAMILCAR ALIVISATOS,
Athens, Greece.

REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAN CHARLES R. BROWN,
New Haven, Conn.

PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
New York, N.Y.

REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.

PROF. DR. J. EUGENE CHOISY,
Geneva, Switzerland.

REV. S. D. CHOWN, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada.

DR. J. A. CRAMER,
Utrecht, Holland.

PROF. DR. ADOLF DEISSMANN,
Berlin, Germany.

REV. A. W. FORTUNE, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky.

DR. W. E. GARRISON,
Chicago, Ill.

PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE,
London, England.

MOST REV. METROPOLITAN GERMANOS,
Thyatira, Asia Minor.

PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER,
Elon College, N. C.

DR. HENRY T. HODGKIN,
Wallingford, Pa.

REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAN W. R. INGE,
London, England.

PROF. RUFUS M. JONES,
Haverford, Pa.

DR. ADOLPH KELLER
Geneva, Switzerland

BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL,
New York, N. Y.

BISHOP WILLIAM F. MCDOWELL,
Washington, D.C.

REV. JOHN HOWARD MELISH
Brooklyn, N. Y.

REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

DR. WILFRED MONOD,
Paris, France.

DR. C. C. MORRISON,
Chicago, Ill.

DR. JOHN R. MOTT,
New York, N.Y.

BISHOP HARALD OSTENFELD,
Copenhagen, Denmark.

BISHOP EDWARD L. PARSONS,
San Francisco, Calif.

PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS,
Lancaster, Pa.

PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE,
Oxford, England.

PASTOR DR. FRIEDRICH SIEGMUND-SCHULTZE,
Berlin, Germany.

DR. ROBERT E. SPEER,
New York, N.Y.

DR. HENRY VAN DYKE,
Princeton, N. J.

REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich.

BISHOP BOYD VINCENT,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK,
York, England.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
APRIL, 1932

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK

HAVE these times no meaning to us? There are millions of people out of employment. Crime was never so frequent nor so bold. Suicide of the wealthy has become a common occurrence. Suspicion and hate are everywhere. If it were the problem of a single nation it would not be so serious, but it is a world problem. Is there no remedy? The Roman Catholic church is not able to meet it; neither is the Eastern Orthodox church; nor the Anglican church. Protestantism is not the remedy. The world is little concerned as to what these four groups have to contribute. In some instances what they have to say is treated with politeness; in other instances with scorn. They have all been tried and they are found wanting. The world needs something better than any one of these groups can give. Separately they go to their tasks limping, however gorgeously dressed they may be. A divided Christendom is a lame institution. If ever the world needed a united Christendom it is now. In facing the task such as we face to-day there is no difficulty in finding a motive for unity. Christians must be less interested in denominational loyalty and more interested in brotherhood with all Christians. It is a pathetic call to listen to denominational leaders calling for loyalty to denominations when Christ stands in the midst call-

ing for loyalty to himself—"Come unto me". It is the sacrifice of one or the other—which shall it be? Is it that we do not see him? Or that we do not see the world's need of salvation? Or that we are uncertain as to whether the remedy is in Jesus or in our denomination? Why are we hesitant in making an experiment in Christian brotherhood? All sorts of barriers have been set up to keep us apart and those most loyal to the barriers are frequently counted the most devout Christians. What foolishness! How long shall we tax the patience of our heavenly Father? It is still a fact that the hope of the world is in Jesus, but not in the Jesus of a divided discipleship. His crucifixion was first in the house of his friends; it is being perpetuated in the house of his friends. Is this to be always so?

THE president of *The Christian Union Quarterly,* Incorporated, Mr. W. H. Hoover, recently passed from us in his 83d year. He had been critically ill for some time and his passing was not unexpected. He was the founder and president of the Hoover Sweeper Company, North Canton, Ohio. He started at the bottom and built up a great business. The Hoover sweeper is known around the world and it is the best on the market. But Mr. Hoover himself was an institution. He read the best books and kept up with present day thinking. He was superintendent of the Sunday-school and teacher of the men's class for fifty years. He had the genius of finding struggling institutions of liberal outlook and making himself a part of those institutions by liberal gifts. He never sought to direct

their policy or in any way to control their thinking; but, having found individuals here and there who were working at an idea, he gave his money freely to help in the enlargement of that idea, leaving its development to the individual. In this particular he was extraordinary, always sympathetic and dependable. He preferred to search out rather than to be sought after and thereby gave a certain fellowship to his giving that made him a real comrade. As to how much he gave away will doubtless never be known, but dozens of institutions can tell what he was to them when the struggle was most uncertain. He has been an indispensable friend in the history of *The Christian Union Quarterly*. He was a Christian of that fine type that delighted in doing what he did without any element of publicity attached to it. He will be remembered as an adventurous soul. He stood for the equality of all Christians before God as related to church membership, the Lord's supper, and all other expressions of fellowship. He will be remembered as a pioneer in gifts for Christian unity. He is the first person, as far as we know, that ever gave an endowment for this cause. Others will come after him. He was not afraid to go forward.

THE Christian Unity League is planning for a conference in St. Louis the first week in May. It will be held at the St. John's Methodist Episcopal church, south, and the minister of that church, Dr. Ivan Lee Holt, is chairman of the committee. Bishop J. F. McConnell of New York will be one of the evening speakers and Dr. Herbert L. Willett of Chicago will present

the report of the commission on the next steps in "The United Church of the United States" of which commission he is chairman. Every Protestant in that area will not only want to be present but will want to share in the discussion. The question of the denominational school, the denominational journal, the denominational missionary work, and other denominational adventures are to come under review, as never before in a public conference, with the questions as to whether the time has not come for the coöperation, if not the consolidation, of these divided interests of Protestantism. To every thoughtful person 215 divisions in American Christianity cannot continue without permanent injury to the cause of Christ. If one approach does not help, we must look for another and continue looking until some help is found. It cannot be that there is no way out of this entanglement. If equality of all Christians before God is not the next advance, some one must guide us to another. This condition cannot last indefinitely. It is already a gross reflection on the intelligence of Christians. The past may take care of itself. It is not the question of What was? but the question of What is? Christians must establish brotherhood among themselves or organized Christianity will cease to be the interpreter of Christ.

NEXT year the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America will come to its twenty-fifth anniversary. The Council has done a good work, a work that has been both necessary and difficult. In these twenty-five years it has become a permanent fac-

tor in the life of American Protestantism. It has wonderfully helped our Protestant denominations toward a larger fellowship. We could not do without it. It has been particularly courageous on social affairs, going forward in its thinking in the face of adverse criticism. But an organization is nothing if it does not raise adverse criticism somewhere. There are all kinds of people, and reactionary thinking is a factor to be reckoned with in political, social, and religious affairs. The need now in the life of the Federal Council is some step toward Christian unity. There was a time when it was wise to maintain a policy of reticence. Not many people were thinking in terms of unity when the Council was started. But the times have changed. The Council has helped to change the times. The world is thinking now in terms of unity. For the Council not to go ahead will prove hurtful to its place of leadership. The Protestant churches in America must begin a definite move toward unity. If all the Presbyterians could get together, if all the Methodists could get together, if all the Baptists could get together, if the smaller groups could find their places, we would be moving in the right direction. This is the way the United Church of Canada started and there is wisdom in it. The Federal Council is the organization to take the lead in this.

THE Faith and Order movement is looking toward another conference at Lausanne in 1937. This movement has made a large contribution. Not only the Lausanne conference of 1927, but all its conferences since it started in 1910 have helped toward understand-

ing among Christians. The non-creedal and the creedal churches need to know each other better; it is likewise so regarding the priesthood. There can be no proper appreciation of each other without some personal knowledge. There are differences to be sure, wide differences, but we can have no knowledge as to the possibility of spanning these chasms until we have met in conference. What we now know of each other is largely fictitious. We have not only got to confer together, but we have got to worship together. To tell how one worships is not to be compared with sharing in one's worship. We have got to get away from a great deal of the unreasonable in our exclusiveness and come to know that more important than our separate religious body is the Lord Jesus and an unsaved world. How can we follow him in entering upon this job of bringing the world to know him? We have been doing it separately for a long time. The Faith and Order movement is a reminder that there are possibilities of doing it jointly. There is no need of asking any intelligent person which is the better method. These churches have many finely educated men and women in them; has Christian education been so defective that it has been unable to see that there can be no real Christian education unless it is founded upon brotherhood with all Christians? More important than the sciences, more important than the languages, more important than the philosophies, is the understanding that brotherhood is as fundamental in Christianity as that Jesus is the Christ. The denial of either one of these is immaterial, for to deny one is to involve the other. Let us find in the Faith and Order movement the possibility of upholding both.

P. A.

"THIS IS MY BODY"

By Rev. Alfred E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.
Principal of New College, University of London, London, England

IN his charge, delivered at his primary visitation, now published under the title *Thoughts on Some Problems of the Day,* the archbishop of York deals, among other subjects with "Eucharistic Doctrine." His opening sentences must arrest attention: "It is sometimes mentioned as a grievous paradox that the divisions of Christendom should arise about the sacrament of unity. Grievous it certainly is; but to any other than a superficial observer it is no paradox. The unity which ought to exist among the disciples of Christ is not mere common feeling; it is fellowship, partnership, communion, *κοινωνία* of the Holy Spirit. It is natural rather than paradoxical, that where unity is impaired, this should be reflected in its sacramental expression" (p. 133). I am running the risk of being regarded as "a superficial observer" in differing very respectfully from his grace, in still regarding the divisions at the table of the common Lord as a paradox. Is there not a common faith, hope, and love towards the Lord Jesus Christ in personal Christian experience to ensure an adequate fellowship, which is not mere feeling so as to justify a common participation in "the sacrament of unity"? In answering this question with an emphatic affirmation I am, I believe, expressing the general conviction of those, not Free churchmen alone but church-

men as well, who desire that the beginnings even of the movement towards Christian reunion should be made manifest to the world in partaking of the one bread and the one cup.

I recognize, however, that not Anglicans only, but Lutheran and Reformed churches on the continent, at one time Scottish Presbyterians, and even now the strict Baptists regard the privileges of fellowship at the table as confined to those who are in the same ecclesiastical communion; the observance does not attach itself for them to what is common to all Christians, but expresses rather agreement in creed, ritual, and polity. I refrain from raising the issue, which of these two views is the more "superficial" as that would be a controversial challenge. I add only this, that I try to carry out the golden rule in the American humorist's version by endeavoring in all charity "to be the other fellow." I can find a justification for this second view if there is a necessary connection between the essential unity of "the body of Christ" and the external mode of its manifestation to the world in "faith and order." For me there is no such necessary connection; but I respect the convictions of those for whom there is. What we who hold the first view must learn is to recognize that our brethren who hold the second view, and so feel under obligation to deny us the freedom of their celebrations are not less charitable, than we are, in withholding what their conscience forbids them to share. What is even more important than the solution of this present practical problem in the movement towards the reunion of the churches is that Christians should try to rise above the differences of interpretation of the ordinance to

realize the common experience and the common purpose which they can share together; for where the metaphysics divide, the faith, hope, and love towards the Lord Jesus Christ may unite. The main purpose of this article is to explore the possibilities of mutual understanding, and the archbishop's statement of what the Lord's supper means to him holds out, after the less promising beginning, a large measure of encouragement; for I gladly find myself in agreement with him.

But before I state the points of agreement, let me indicate by what steps I rise above the view which some of my Congregational brethren hold to what they would probably describe as a high church view, although it is substantially the view held by Dr. Dale, and is still held by some of our scholars and thinkers. To me a symbol is a vain show, unless it so appeals to those to whom it is addressed that it not only expresses but conveys what it expresses. The bread and the wine, or rather the breaking the bread and the passing of the cup, for the acts are more significant than the objects, are not effective symbols, unless they prove to faith the means of grace, Christ offering himself to be received. I resent the use of the phrase "mere commemoration," when employed in depreciation of a view which begins where Christ himself bade his disciples begin: "This do in remembrance of me." For even when regarding our beloved, "absent from the body, at home with the Lord" we long for "the touch of a vanished hand, and the sound of a voice that is still" is there "mere commemoration," are not faith that they live with Christ, hope of once sharing their glory, and love for them as thus living in glory quickened and strengthened? How

much more must commemoration of him who died, and rose again and liveth for evermore rend "the veil of sense between," and give us his real presence not corporeal in the elements (transubstantial, or consubstantial), but in all that the whole ordinance expresses and conveys to faith. But where he is, there he gives; his presence is grace, God acting in us and for us not only to bring us into closer communion with himself, but thereby into greater conformity to his perfection. Communion means conformity; we become like him when we see him as he is. (Never can I forget the impression made upon me by one of Henry Drummond's Christmas booklets, *Likeness by Looking*). But we cannot be passive recipients of grace, faith energizes in love; our consecration to him is our response to his communication of himself to us. Of course he can, and does give himself to us by other means, such as the Gospel preached not in man's unwisdom or weakness, but in the wisdom and power of God, or in the experiences of life. When sacramentalists emphasize the special grace of the sacraments, I cannot but ask, what more or what else can Christ give but himself, and will he not always give as much of himself as our faith wills us to receive? At this point I can pass to the archbishop's exposition.

I shall not attempt closely to reproduce his thoughts, but rather express what thoughts his have stimulated in me, recalling some already familiar, suggesting others now new.

(1) The archbishop lays stress upon the immediate antecedents of the acts of Jesus. Knowing as he did, the resolve which was being shaped in the mind of Judas,

he made the last appeal of his restraining grace in offering Judas the choice morsel as token of favor. When that appeal failed, he did nothing to prevent the traitor's going on his deadly errand. He speeded him even with the words: "That thou doest, do quickly!" Why did he do nothing to hinder? It would have been contrary to the method of his whole ministry to have used force, when love had failed. But still more the failure was to him the token that the hour had come to declare, and in declaring to confirm his own resolve of sacrifice. (May I add here the removal of a difficulty I have myself felt; for Judas' sake should not the act of treachery have been prevented? This difficulty has for my mind been relieved by the consideration, that the resolve was so fixed in Judas as to be morally the equivalent of the act; prevented the resolve would have been, as it were, a festering moral sore in him; allowed, it produced a reaction, if not of godly repentance, yet of a remorse that made him not so bad a man as he might have been; to hinder a wrong threatened to another is a duty, to submit to a wrong oneself no evasion of duty, but may be a duty itself.)

(2) The archbishop emphasizes the acts of Jesus as his declaration to his disciples of his surrender of himself to the will of God. The wicked suffer, and their suffering is often the penalty of their transgression. The innocent suffer with the guilty; this is the sacrifice that is the inevitable consequence of the solidarity of the race, the dependence for weal or woe of men on one another. The righteous may freely offer himself for, or accept suffering on behalf of others; this is self-sacrifice. It may be said that in the historical situation

the death of Christ was the inevitable consequence of his ministry. Certainly; but he might have actively resisted, or passively accepted this consequence. He *willed* it in obedience to God and compassion for man, as the ransom for many, the blood of the new covenant. It was thus that he desired his disciples to think of, and accept his death. "He was offering his life," says Dr. Temple, "in sacrifice—consecrated to God and received by his brethren" (p. 143). It used to be the orthodox doctrine that our Lord's death was a sin-offering; and that it should be understood as a penal substitution; he was punished instead of us. It is doubtful whether any of the Levitical sacrifice ever had that meaning; and in my judgment it is an impossible interpretation.

(3) Much more adequate as an analogy, though imperfect, is the type of sacrifice of which Dr. W. Robertson Smith gave so full an exposition in his book, *The Religion of the Semites*. "The sacramental meal was an appropriate expression of the antique ideal of religious life," says he, "not merely because it was a social act and an act in which the god and his worshippers were conceived as partaking together, but because the very act of eating and drinking with a man was a symbol and a confirmation of fellowship and mutual social obligations" (p. 269). "There is," he further says, "no sacrificial feast according to Semitic usage except where a victim is slaughtered" (p. 280). According to the primitive idea the god, the worshippers, and the animal victim all shared a common life. That life was renewed when it seemed as if the common bond were loosened, by the god and the clansmen sharing the common life as for them not symbolically represented,

but actually present in the blood of the victim; the wooden or the stone altar was sprinkled with the blood, and thus the god received it; the victim was eaten, and so the blood received by the worshippers, or the blood might be sprinkled upon them. These things seem barbarous to us now; but are they not real, if crude attempts to express man's need of the divine life, and a recognition that life more abundant comes only through surrendered life? Much is made by some opponents of the orthodox doctrine of the atonement of the prominence in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* of the blood *sprinkling* rather than the blood *shedding;* but the writer of that epistle says expressly: "without shedding of blood there is no remission." The life that is imparted to men through Christ was a life surrendered to God, and that surrender was in the broken body and shed blood. "We repeat his actions," says Dr. Temple, "that we may enter into their meaning, receiving the life he offered in sacrifice that in its power we may offer ourselves a sacrifice in union with his" (p. 143). The sacrificial meal was the corporate act of the whole clan (every clansman had to be present at it); and the common life was renewed in that corporate act. Even so is the eucharist the corporate act of the Christian church; and if our divisions prevent the participation of the whole body outwardly, in spirit at least we should ever think and feel ourselves as taking part in the corporate act of the one church of Christ on earth and in heaven; we should be compassed by a great cloud of witnesses. He gave his physical body in his sacrifice that by sharing a common life in him, believers might all become his body on earth, not only in an invisible

spiritual unity, but in a manifest unity of witness, worship, and work in the world.

(4) As his body was offered in sacrifice unto God on behalf of men, so does the church as his body on earth, whenever and wherever its members join in this corporate act not only proclaim his death as the sacrifice of the new covenant, the relation between God and men that he imparts, but also its incorporation in him, so that he in it through the members may continue to offer the sacrifice which is the world's salvation. This is a truth which Protestants in their dread of the travesty of it in the mass are prone to forget. The travail by which the kingdom comes is not at an end, and Christ endures that travail in his church, as that church must endure it with him. It may be that the triumph waits because the travail fails. As the archbishop so fully urges; the church, as was Paul, must be crucified with Christ, not only in its own death to its own sin, but also in its solicitude and service to remove the world's sin, if it is to be raised with him in the fulness of his life in God. In such thoughts about the Lord's supper Anglican and Nonconformist may meet, even if they do not yet sit often there together.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

THE CRISIS THEOLOGY AND THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT*

By ADOLPH KELLER, D.D.
General Secretary of the Conference on Life and Work,
Geneva, Switzerland

(Translated from the German by Selby Vernon McCasland, Ph.D.,
Professor of Religion in Goucher College, Baltimore, Maryland)

THE dialectical theology can no more obliterate the ecumenical movement than the latter can it. In so far as it proceeds not from the point of view of the thought of a particular time, but from a supereccle-siastical, superconfessional, supernational, supertheologi-cal standpoint, whether it would or not, it becomes a sort of parallel to the ecumenical development. It en-counters the ecumenical movement as a whole not only as every church meets it, in definite single problems, but in an attitude which lies deeper than the confessional and sectarian interests which have up to the present inspired or separated the churches. A reckoning with one another is, therefore, inevitable and indeed has already begun. Only the place where a fruitful discus-sion can take place has not yet been found, because there is as yet no clear understanding of what the ecumenical movement as a whole is. It still has to fight against mis-understandings just as the dialectical theology does. This

* Translated from *Der Weg der dialektischen Theologie durch die kirchliche Welt,* by Adolf Keller, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, Munich, 1931. Note reviews of literature of this theological movement in this issue with a brief exposition of the theology.

cannot be otherwise because the ecumenical movement is not a concept, system, unified organization, definitely desired goal, but a movement, need, longing, dynamic of faith, trust in the leading of the Spirit, openness and obedience to a divine vision.

The dialectical movement takes its stand against the ecumenical movement for deeper reasons than nationalism, confessionalism, or pietistic individualism does. The idea which the dialectical theology conceives of the present ecumenical movement is not clear. It is evident that it does not rest upon investigation and study, upon thorough factual knowledge, but upon a fundamental presupposition, a criticism of certain aspects which readily attract attention, observation of the weaknesses and faults of the movement, and not upon essential insight into the act of faith of Stockholm, not upon reverence for the invisible God who may be present with his Spirit even in this human undertaking. To most of the leading dialectical theologians, a few of the younger ones excepted, the Lausanne movement appears as Christian pride and Stockholm as visionary speculation or a faint, imperfect volition of an end, without regard to the means, which promises nothing. The question whether this movement has a Christian right to exist is stated with great clearness, especially by Gogarten. He accuses the church of sticking its head in the sand of the "evangelical culture program of Stockholm and Lausanne."

It is especially important for the ecumenical movement to consider these criticisms earnestly, but it is also to be hoped that the dialectical theology will discover the earnestness of the ecumenical question. Where are these criticisms to be found? Especially in the address

of Karl Barth on "The Need of the Evangelical Church," which has just appeared in the magazine *Zwischen den Zeiten*, part 2, 1931.

The question which he there directs to the church runs: Does the church find itself in need, not only in the need of its casual existence, but in the need which is really vital to it? If it is not in need, it is not an evangelical church. If, therefore, the ecumenical movement, which indeed is only an expression of the life of the churches, does not express this vital need of the churches under the cross, it is untrue to its nature. The essential need into which it comes is that it has recognized, "the crucified Christ on the outside and sees itself rejected and condemned by the church which once was." Christ's being crucified and being on the outside is the fundamental insight of the evangelical church and signifies its need. Only as the crucified one is Christ the divine life of the church, but not "as a mighty organizing principle of an actual elevation of humanity into the sphere of the divine."

In addition to this real need, Barth speaks of a second "not good and not saving need of the church" in its present existence. It derives, according to him, from the retreat of the church from that which according to its nature is really demanded of it. It retreats before its visible expression. It ought to be visible indeed in a very definite condition. Where it becomes visible as a human affair, form and essential reality divide asunder and no synthesis is possible. "The kingdom of heaven and the Prussian general synod" cannot mean the same, although one does speak of one and the same thing. Catholicism knows a synthesis here, but the evangeli-

cal church does not. It knows only the synthesis which God himself produces between the human cause and the divine reality.

Certainly in the consideration of the churches which have entered the ecumenical movement, first of all, the second "not good" need of their casual existence attracts one's attention. A need is as said one of the roots of the ecumenical movement. But it is not only this "not good" need which has led the churches together to a common repentance and a new obedience. Therein lay really a protest against the previous casualty of the church's existence, a criticism of the existing church world which retreats before a very definite requirement of its nature and no more dares to give a sign of this one nature, but prefers to flee into the invisibility of a principle and into the visibility of an established church in need of correction. "The flight from the invisible into the visible church has nothing to do with the situation of man confronted with the crucified Christ," says Barth. Where the church seeks to become visible in the midst of a concrete world, there at once the terrible contrasts between form and facts become visible, between what it means and what it says and does, there at once its losses are evident.

But Barth emphasizes here in this analysis that it is the church of sinners, and that really in its weakness and vulnerability there is a sign "that God who one time entered into lowliness is here present, here to be preached and to be heard."

Why should this significance of the weakness of the church, which belongs to its essential nature, not also be found in the ecumenical movement? What one sees

is really weakness. No one knows that better than those who are in it. In the movement in fact the conflict between the churches is shown, the reciprocal tensions and criticisms, the slowness of heart and faith. The movement reveals the whole problem of the present situation much more than it gives a solution. It shows the ruins and the stones lying about, but there is as yet no building. It is a struggle against church existence, church narrowness and slowness, church and confessional nationalism, church division and also against provincial claims of unity. Here greatness, glory, result, consciousness of self and power are not found. But consolation is really to be found in that in this human-all-too-humanness, in this lowliness, weakness and insufficiency of the church visibility, in this division from one another, striving for union with one another and never uniting, even yet the same God must be active who laid his Son in the manger and is with us in the manger and in his poverty. This conception of spirit, this comfort, this faith of Stockholm is nevertheless found in no statute and in no official records, but it grows in those who are certain of God in his invisibility and lowliness.

Karl Barth will be able to accept that on the one assumption that the first, the real, need of the evangelical church, the need of the cross, is rightly perceived and understood. That this is everywhere the case, I would not dare to affirm. I can only say here, just as Barth, what I see before my eyes. There is to be seen in some churches a feeling of security, a dream of power and victory in the world, where they are prospering, a determined will which believes that it can transform,

evangelize, socialize the world; a feeling of power deriving from a consciousness of power and a task; a self-consciousness in national and confessional form; a power of organization and achievement pointing to accomplishments; which is all certainly far away from the church which is under the cross and bears the reproach of Christ. But remarkable! Where these bearers of power, dignity and spirit, where these organizers and leaders in the midst of their consciousness of spirit and power are addressed with the question of the cross, are touched by it, perhaps in a common worship, there reigns every time not the proud disdain, the triumphing reference to deeds and results, but the consciousness of the reproach of Christ and the form of the cross in his church in the world. If Jesus, really Jesus, stands before the speaker, I have not yet heard the confession of the Great Inquisitor out of any mouth.

In the paradoxical manner of faith, in spite of the dullness and superficiality, in spite of the church conscious of power and rejoicing in organizations which we find, under the surface we may assume as somehow present that deeper and essential need. Again and again there is to be heard out of all self-conscious faith the "I believe, Lord, help my unbelief." "I obey, help my disobedience" is the quiet, often more unconscious, petition along with all the visible activity, to which even the churches in the ecumenical movement feel themselves called. Is a notorious unfaithfulness and disobedience which speaks in this way really unfaithfulness and disobedience from God's point of view? I mean here that the dialectical theology with its criticism should have rendered the ecumenical movement the service

of making the essential need perceptible in the "not good" need, but also of believing in the working of God in the church, in the humanness of the ecumenical movement, who indeed in a paradoxical fashion desires to work precisely in this "so human affair." Indeed the church, the ecumenical movement, may confess that the power of God is manifest in weakness. But to this weakness belong, more deeply seen, not only poverty and powerlessness, but also successful struggling and striving, the joy of accomplishment, foolish speaking and stammering, worldly church politics, and as many other things as characterize earthly nature. The ecumenical movement to-day needs especially the faith that God is powerful in weakness.

For after five years, as Archbishop Söderblom said, for most movements a crisis comes, where they are in danger of transforming movement into organization, questioning and experimentation into a definite policy, of measuring and testing human and church possibilities, of substituting method for need and the cry from the depths, of believing in the power of efficiency and cooperation, of considering as accomplishment that which was previously an act of penitence and faith. The movement experiences just as does the church that a spiritual inspiration does not become a possession, but is to be preserved in affliction and in the mystery of a divine power.

The second question which the dialectical theology asks of the church and thereby also of the ecumenical movement is for the justification and the meaning of the new Christian realism, which has appeared to-day in the "century of the church" in the desire for form,

authority, visibility and efficiency, concreteness of action, church politics, popularity. This criticism is divided into particular questions. Why is the church only concerned with the general problem of its visible existence instead of with the question of its essential existence? Why is the confession of faith exchanged for a study of history? Why does it not look out anxiously toward the eschatological horizon? Why is there concern about the existence instead of the nature of the church? Why does it express itself so positively with reference to its possession of the Gospel? "What does possession mean when it refers to the Gospel? By all means not to have it in one's pocket, or in a barn, and not even in one's head or in the depths of one's conscience." The certainty of the possession of salvation therefore is criticized. The knowledge of the way, the method, the social and national recipe, the possibilities of winning power, is held before it as a sign that its possession in fact betrays a lack, that its penitence is not genuine, not a cry out of the depths, that it has an answer before it has correctly grasped the question, that it takes the question of power more earnestly than that of the kingdom of God, and therefore presents too close a connection between evangelical and national.

It is impossible here to reply to these criticisms in detail. If for no other reason, because the fundamental question is alive in the ecumenical movement itself. Perhaps not in every church council, not in every technical commission, but in the movement as a whole, in its origin, in its spiritually sensitive places, in its high and deep points. For example, in its services of worship, where the conferences do not face the immediate, con-

crete tasks but the call of God, the need of the whole world, the cry of church people in all lands. It requires of the churches not only the old eternal Gospel, but the word of the hour, the concrete decision of the burning problems of the present, that is, a Christian realism.

This realism is no new message, no new Gospel, but the search for an answer for the question what the old Gospel signifies in our time with its peculiar social and international questions, what decisions, what answer it demands of us at this time, this fateful moment of world crisis? For the first time this question is faced not by individual Christians and churches, but by the whole of Christianity through the ecumenical movement.

The question whether this realism rises from the mere human urge to activity, or merely from fanciful church speculation, as Gogarten says, from a church desire for power, organization, efficiency, or from a more eager listening for the call of God to our time, from the desire to be obedient, is throughout justified and belongs to the unceasing self criticism which the dialectical theology itself so uncompromisingly demands of the church.

But no one knows that. Even the dialectical theology does not. Only God alone. Just as little as—according to the dialectical view—from human or ethical conduct it can be told who a Christian is, so little can the inner earnestness of those questions be read from the external activity of the churches or the ecumenical movement. There is no criterion, not even for the dialectical theology, for the inner attitude of a Christian or a church to God, if one will not accept the saying about

the fruit of the Spirit. The modern psychology of the subconscious provides the dialectical theology with the evidence of experience for this judgment. For the psychology of compensation has recognized that the empirical, visible spiritual condition, in experience which is otherwise accessible, is not decisive for the determination of spiritual reality.

The psychology of compensation has taught that it is wise in the judgment of a man to begin with the opposite of that which he presents or says or pretends to be. Experience shows that the proud and vain often inwardly feels himself weak, that shy persons border on illusions of greatness, that the ethical fanatic suffers from bad dreams which he combats through devotion to the opposite, that the unapproachable knows a dangerous need of love, and that the atheist is a seeker after God. It is in place to consider whether such boasting of church power, such ecclesiastical and theological self-consciousness, such certainty, is not really the extroversion of an inner emptiness and poverty, the covering up of a bad conscience, a shame which knows no other way to express this emptiness than through its opposite, just as on the other side it is not so clear whether behind the continuous talk about need and human uncertainty there is not indeed the appearance of the certainty of a "theology of need."

With that nothing else is said that what Dostojevski and the dialectical theology teach: "that indeed only sin is evident, but not the relation of man to God." So in fact only the weakness of the ecumenical movement is evident: the slowness and indolence of the churches, the confusion and division, the lack of cour-

age. How far the ecumenical work is borne by real penitence, faith, eschatological hope, that is, how far the church is earnest in its prayer, its thought, its search and activity, escapes our knowledge. Just as according to the dialectical view the Christian is known only to God, so also this earnestness or lack of it is known only to God. Many would be thankful, therefore, to the dialectical theology on its side if its judgment of hearts and churches did not sound out so loudly and certainly.

Indeed acquaintance with the ecumenical movement shows with disturbing power through what fearful inner need the churches are passing to-day. With that I do not mean the fear of their collapse, the hunger in the Transylvanian manses, the cry of Jugoslavian orphans, the starving of Hungarian students, the concern for the evangelical schools in east European countries, the needs of the numberless institutions of home missions, but I mean the fundamental need which is expressed in concern for the church, the deep anxiety for the preservation of its substance, penitence because of the guilt of the church, the entire uncertainty about its inner fate, the trustful despair in the midst of its brokenness. One does not hear that in the statements of consistories and in conference reports. But one hears it in the lonely manses in Poland and Jugoslavia, and when he sits down together with the responsible leaders of the church in Hungary and Rumania, in Belgium, France, and Italy. One can hear it also in Germany and Switzerland, in the north and in England. One hears it from laymen who love the church and are despairing of it. One can also hear it from bishops. It can even be heard in proud and satisfied America, whose

clearest official expressions betray so much certainty and consciousness. The inner need trembles here and there even in that activism, and in the midst of the church activity there is falling over men the feeling that salvation cannot come from it, not from the greatness and power of the church, but alone from the divine power of God, from his mercy upon the world. Karl Barth speaks too much out of the environment of a narrow church circle, out of a national, church political situation and the psychology created by it. The more he enters and works into the ecumenical world, the more will he come to perceive the "essential need" of the church. What he preaches and desires, this essential quality, in spite of theological rejections and consistorial refutation, is much better heard and understood than he knows, if not in the church hierarchy, yet far and wide among the pastors, who are after all the most impenitent group, and still more in a large part of the laiety of all churches, where theology and politics have not yet wrought the devastations upon the substance of the church which Barth finds in "churchliness." Incidentally one may wonder, moreover, whether the officials in their office, in their responsibility, in their irritating daily struggle, have not taken upon themselves a sort of vicarious suffering in order that the theologians and prophets may carry on their work.

* * * *

The ecumenical movement and the dialectical theology are throwing the churches into a critical and tragic position from which there is only one and the same escape. For both movements are leading the churches

to the disturbing insight into the surpassing human greatness of the world problems and to the conviction that there is no other help in this situation than turning to God.

It is becoming clear to the individual churches, entangled and burdened as they are, that no empirical church through ever so much honest and illuminated will and social work can offer a solution, that the churches by their will and work can never save the world. The tragedy of their situation lies in the fact that they are approaching a task with the consciousness that it is too great and heavy, too demonically charged, but that they must approach it nevertheless, because the call of the hour, the challenge of the Spirit, the knowledge of the Gospel, require it of them. That is indeed probably the situation in which the dialectical theology would see the churches, in a position in fact which humanly expressed is impossible. It actually reveals the limits of religion and its power of achievement and points to God, who alone is still equal to the situation. The ecumenical movement enters this situation with no ready solutions, no feeling of power, but only because God is present, because his coming into human night, weakness, despair, may be hoped for, because we believe in the Holy Spirit which is promised us. *Veni Creator spiritus!*

ADOLF KELLER.

UNION IN HIS NAME

By Rev. John B. Cowden
Author of *St. Paul on Christian Unity*, Nashville, Tenn.

IN Acts 3:1-6 and 4:1-18 and many other similar passages the New Testament makes it clear that "*in his name*" was the distinctive mark and broad essential of apostolic Christianity. The early church had, of course, other essentials, which were held in common with Judaism; but the name of the Lord Jesus Christ was an innovation, and soon became the distinctive mark of the new religious sect or cult. This exaltation of the name Jesus offended the Jews, caused their bitter opposition, and finally led to a separation of Jews and Christians. "*In his name,*" as held and applied by the first disciples of Christ, was the final genuine seal that marked every thing in their religion as Christian. They put the name of Jesus into everything that they said and did, and made it the focal center of all their work and worship and the rallying point of their unity. It is hard for us to-day, when the name of Christ has become a platitude that is taken for granted, to realize the position and influence that this name had in the early church. This article, therefore, proposes a study of this theme, and an application of the same to the church of to-day.

If the first disciples had done, as they were asked by the Jewish leaders, dropped the name of Jesus from their work and worship, there would have been no

Christian church. Christianity would have died "still born," and soon passed from the memories of the living; but the faithful few disciples stood loyally by this name, even going to a martyrdom with the name of the Lord Jesus Christ upon their lips. The blood of these first martyrs became the fertile propagating stream of Christianity, carrying the name of Jesus and his cause throughout the then known world. As we look back upon their loyalty and devotion, it seems to us a misdirected zeal. Why and how could there be such a zeal for a mere name? Was it another "zeal without knowledge," which Paul saw in the Jews, but could not see in himself? Was it a mere fetish of an ignorant people that has passed away in the clear light and vision of to-day? These are questions that present themselves to the modern mind, and demand an answer. It is the contention of this article that it was none of these—not religious fanaticism, but the most reasonable and enlightened religion, and furthermore that the name of the Lord Jesus Christ needs to be restored to its former position and influence in the church.

In the first place, such a use of the name of Jesus was according to the teaching of Jesus himself—Mat. 10:22, 42; 18:5, 20; 24:9; Mark 9:38-41; 16:17; Jno. 14:12-14, 26; 15:16-21; 16:23-26. Both by precept and example he impressed upon his disciples the vital importance and the consequent danger of wearing his name. This was not egotism and pride on the part of Jesus to see his name exalted and honored, nor foolhardiness on the part of his disciples to bring upon themselves the wrath and destruction of the powers that be by wearing his name, but it was simply the price of

establishing a new religion. Every cause must be associated with some dominant name, or embodied in some sovereign person. A mere abstract cause, however true and powerful, can never reach the common people. This was especially true of Christianity, which according to John was the divine word become flesh, or incarnated in the person of Jesus, so Jesus was Christianity, and his name the banner of the same. Loyalty to his name became the acid test of a Christian. Not the mere hypocritical wearing of this name, however. Jesus condemned this in the severest of words—Mat. 7:22-23. He knew that some would make a fetish of his name, and seek to reap honor and glory from the mere wearing of it; while others like Simon the sorcerer would selfishly desire the emoluments of the same. All such is the prostitution of the name of Jesus that merits the wrath and condemnation of high heaven.

Furthermore, names in those days meant something. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for it is he that shall save his people." "And they shall call his name Emmanuel"—God with us. So it was that the son of Elizabeth and Zacharias was called John—sent of heaven—and Simon was called Peter—rock man, etc. There was something in a name then, especially a religious name. The name embodied the cause. However, to-day a name means little or nothing; and along with this modern disregard for names the name of Jesus has dropped from its original high place in the church, and has been largely discarded for some denominational name. Even those that still cling to this non-sectarian name wear it very loosely, and manifest faint praise and weak loyalty for this name that is above every name. "Wherefore also

God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on the earth and the things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Such was the ideal of the first church; and they exalted his name accordingly; but the name of Jesus is not so honored by the church to-day. It is another instance of, "He came unto his own, and his own received him not"; or at least they do not receive and wear his name with the same loyalty and devotion as his first disciples. To-day his name is no longer the touchstone of Christian discipleship, the alluring inspiration of the church, and the gravitating center of its unity. It has drifted far from the center of Christianity out toward the circumference of the life and activity of the church to-day; and the church without this focal center has separated into wandering, warring sects. The name of the Lord Jesus Christ, therefore, needs to be restored to its vital central place in the church that the church may again be gathered into unity about this name.

But, reply is made, the name of Jesus is not sufficient for Christian unity, else we would have unity to-day, because his name is still held and revered by all. Theoretically this is true, but practically it is not; or at least it is not the vital center of the church's life and activity as it was in the early church. With the name of Jesus restored to its former place in the church, we can at least have Christian fellowship, which is the final step to union. Let us, therefore, consider in more detail the place and function of the name of Jesus in the early

church, with an application of the same to the problem of unity to-day; and let the reader reserve judgment on this name as a sufficient basis for union until the close of this study.

In the first place, all the teaching and preaching of the first disciples were *in the name of Jesus*—Acts 3-4; 5:28-29, 40-42, etc. They were often arrested, imprisoned and persecuted for teaching and preaching in his name; yet they ceased not, "rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonor for the name." All opposition and persecution for such preaching have long since passed away; and along with it has passed the exaltation of the name of Jesus in the preaching of to-day. Christian teachers and preachers do not thus emphasize the name of Jesus. In fact, the name of Jesus is seldom mentioned by many. They teach and preach the truths and principles of Christ; but they do not give him the credit for the same. Others discuss modern theology, philosophy, literature, current events, popular subjects, leading men and women, social and political conditions, etc., without any allusion to or connection with Jesus Christ, all of which failure to teach and preach in the name of Jesus tends toward separation and division in the church. Of course, there can be no uniformity in the preaching and teaching of all; yet all can preach and teach in the common name of Jesus; and consistency with this name will confine all to the message of Jesus, which will go far toward unity in subject matter and content of the lessons and sermons, which will make for the union of the hearers. No teacher or preacher can stray far from the truths and principles of Jesus Christ as long as he teaches and preaches in his

name, because consistency will hold him within the same. The name of Jesus leaves plenty of room for diversity of interpretation and application, because Jesus dealt in broad fundamental principles and universal truths, which permit of broad interpretation and application, so there is no reason for one feeling cramped and restricted by the name of Jesus. With these broad fundamental principles and universal truths of Jesus as the common denominators of the teaching and preaching of all Christians there will result a large unity in the hearers, because people are largely what they are taught. However, there is nothing in the teaching of Jesus to prevent a Christian teacher or preacher from discussing any edifying subject even though it is not contained in his recorded words, because all truth belongs to him, and the Gospels do not claim to be a full and complete revelation of all truth. "Truth came by Jesus Christ," wrote John; and whatever new truth there is in the world it came by him, and should be preached in his name; and the teaching and preaching of all truth in his name will bring all together under a common banner, which means much for Christian unity.

Also, the first disciples suffered *in the name of Jesus,* which was a bond of unity among them. "If ye are reproached for the name of Christ, blessed are ye, because the Spirit of glory and the Spirit of God resteth upon you. . . . If a man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in that name." "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial among you, which cometh upon you to prove you, as though a strange thing happened unto you; but inasmuch as you are partakers of Christ's suffering, rejoice;

that at the revelation of his glory also ye may rejoice with exceeding joy." The bond of suffering is the strongest tie between people, and holds them together in spite of great stress and strain. The occasions for suffering in the name of Jesus have largely passed away, for it is no longer a reproach nor a crime to wear his name; but there are still crosses in the church to be borne,—not the same as those of the first disciples nor as heavy and severe, but nevertheless real crosses; and the cross-bearers of to-day have the same bond of suffering that will hold them together, provided they are borne in the name of Jesus. This fiery suffering in a common name and cause melts the hearts of the sufferers into a lasting unity.

Next, salvation in the early church was *in the name of Jesus.* In the first Christian sermon, preached by Peter on the day of Pentecost, he quoted from Joel, saying, "And it shall be that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved"; and he closed his sermon by commanding all to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of their sins; and again he declared, "In none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among among men, wherein we must be saved." Accordingly, all the conditions or steps looking toward salvation, such as faith, repentance, confession, and baptism, were in the name of Jesus—Acts 3:16; 16:31; 2:38; 22:16; Rom. 10:13-15; and Paul declares that the whole plan of Christian sanctification and justification is in the name of Jesus—I Cor. 6:11. Christian salvation as a whole and all its parts carried the name of Jesus; and in this name alone there were

efficacy and healing. There have been many differences in the church over Christian salvation, some of which have led to separation and division; but all are agreed on the one name of Christ in salvation; and the preaching of salvation in the name of Jesus by all will go far toward confining all to the simple terms prescribed by Jesus and bringing all into unity; or at least the name of Christ will give a common vital center for unity in evangelism. The name of Jesus, however, is not emphasized by the evangelists of to-day as it was by the first evangelists, which is in part responsible for the lack of unity in evangelism.

Furthermore, all religious work was *in the name of Jesus* — Acts 3:6; Mark 9:38-41. Even the smallest benevolence and charity, the giving of a cup of water, as well as the greatest philanthropies, were done in the name of Jesus and for his sake, which united all Christian workers. Not that they all worked together as one group as John insisted on; but the doing of good "in my name" according to Jesus was the vital central thing, and sufficient for Christian unity. The name of Jesus afforded broad freedom, in methods and associations, which John had not learned was necessary for unity, and which many even to-day have not learned. How to work together in a common cause has been a difficult problem in unity from the beginning; and Christ's solution by all working in his name with liberty with respect to everything else is the only practical solution. Thus the first Christian workers were gathered into unity about this name, and the same is sufficient for unity to-day.

But there is no such center for religious work to-day.

Most of religious work to-day is done in the name of some denomination or fraternal order, which separates religious work into as many parts, and leads to division. Only when the task is too great for any single denomination or fraternal order are the separate organizations brought together in benevolent and philanthropic work, and then it is usually in the name of the community chest. The name of Jesus Christ, to whose life and teaching all charity and benevolence are largely due, is rarely mentioned. "Tribute to whom tribute is due; honor to whom honor is due," was an apostolic principle, which Paul urged upon all social workers, including governmental office holders, "for they are ministers of God's service, attending continually upon this very thing," and which is even more applicable to Jesus, the inspirer and author of all good works. But this is not the worst feature of leaving off the name of Jesus in religious and social work; it leads to division, and destroys unity. The name of Jesus affords a common center of work for all individuals and organizations, and thereby insures essential unity, and gives the inspiration of a common lofty banner, under which all can work. Let all Christian workers, therefore, exalt the name of the Lord Jesus Christ in all their good works, and all streams of mercy, benevolence and philanthropy will flow together, blessing all those in need and uniting all Christian workers.

Also, the first disciples worshiped *in the name of Jesus*—John 14:13; I Cor. 1:2; Col. 3:17, etc. This was the daring departure from Jewish worship, which led to a break between Jewish and Christian worshippers, and brought down the wrath and condemnation of

Jewish leaders upon all Christian worshippers. For this reason they were cast out of the temple and synagogues, and forbidden to gather in any place for worship in the name of Jesus; yet they continued to worship in his name in private homes, garrets and cellars, caves and dugouts in the ground, of which the catacombs of Rome still remain, and they were persecuted in every conceivable way. "They had trial of mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonments: they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were tempted, they were slain with the sword: they went about in sheep clothing, in goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, ill treated (of whom the world was not worthy) wandering in deserts and mountains and caves, and holes of the earth," all of which devotion was for the name of Jesus Christ. This was not fanaticism, but loyalty to the very heart of their religion. They looked upon Jesus as the High Priest of their worship, their only mediator between God and man, so they could not, therefore, omit his name from their worship. They did not condemn Jewish worship in the name of Jehovah alone, but they clung tenaciously to the name of Jesus, their great High Priest, and found unity in worship in this name.

Theoretically Jesus is still the High Priest of Christian worship, and all Christians to-day worship in his name without hurt or hindrance; but the name of Jesus is not emphasized and exalted in the worship of Christians to-day as it was in the early church. When opposition to worship in his name and persecution for the same ceased, and worship in his name became popular and universal, the name of Jesus gradually dropped from

its central place in Christian worship until to-day it appears only in the closing of prayers, etc. The order of worship to-day does not feature the name of Jesus; the praise makes little mention of his name; the sermon is not offered in his name; the Lord's supper is often without a mention of his name. In fact, there are few items to-day in the worship that exalt the name of Christ, and thereby stamp the worship as Christian. There is little in the worship of many churches to differentiate the worship from Jewish, Mohammedan, etc., as in fact about the only feature that can do this is the name of Jesus, and with this un-emphasized and un-exalted the worship can not be truly Christian. This name in the early church had great attractive and adhesive powers in binding and holding all in a united worship; and it can do the same for the church to-day. The exaltation of his name in worship will smooth out and cover up many disagreements that disturb and divide worship to-day, because Jesus is the Prince of Peace and the great High Priest of the soul, in whose presence bitterness and littleness can not be cherished. When his name is featured in worship, it brings the worshippers in touch with him, and makes them forget their differences with others.

The name of Jesus also allows a wide diversity in worship, which is essential to unity. He gave only the broad essentials of Christian worship such as, in his name, in spirit and truth, etc., with no prescribed order or ritual of worship, which leaves room for large liberty of form and detail, sufficient to satisfy all classes of taste and culture. Moses gave a fixed order for Jewish worship that allowed little or no freedom; and likewise

some churches to-day have fixed rituals that permit little freedom, and can have unity only by conformity, which would not be acceptable to others. But worship in the name of Jesus Christ with only the broad essentials prescribed, which are accepted by all, is sufficiently elastic and conformable to meet the desires and needs of all and thereby make a united worship possible and desirable.

Lastly, fellowship in the early church was *in the name of Jesus*—Mat. 18:20; Mark 9:38-41; II Tim. 2:19; I Cor. 1:2. The matter of fellowship was not a divisive question in the first church as it is to-day. The fellowship was often threatened with a break, and Paul of the broader fellowship view had now and then to bring Peter and others to task for their narrowness; yet the bridge was always spanned, and the fellowship held by conforming to the simple terms of fellowship laid down by Jesus, namely, all those that work and worship in his name. John on one occasion tried to limit fellowship to those that "follow us"; but Jesus rebuked him, and held it open to all that work and worship in his name, and promised to be in the midst of all those that so work and worship. "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Many to-day, like John, think this fellowship is too broad, and erect other barriers and limitations; but, if Jesus promises his own fellowship to all such, and Paul includes "all that call on the name of the Lord" in a letter to Christians, and commends the same to the fellowship of Timothy, then who am I, or who are you, that we can not do the same? All the followers of Christ gather in his name, and call on the name

of the Lord, so such a fellowship would be open to all, both the orthodox and the un-orthodox, conformist and non-conformist, conservative and progressive, fundamentalist and modernist, Catholic and Protestant, puritan and prodigal, rich and poor, high and low, slave and free, educated and uneducated, in fact, all that work and worship in the name of Jesus, regardless of race, nation, color, creed, culture, social condition, etc. This is too much for the sectarian mind in the church, so many other tests of fellowship have been created and enforced to suit the creed and practice of each denomination, none of which are to be found in the teaching or the practice of Jesus and his apostles. Let us now consider some of these sectarian tests of fellowship.

First, a valid ministry in apostolic succession, which is slowly passing as a barrier to Christian fellowship, is still a hindrance that can not be ignored, and often arises to break the fellowship. Without entering into a discussion of the merits of this age-old question, suffice it to say, such a barrier did not exist in the early church, from which succession is claimed. If Jesus gave any such authority and function to Peter in Mat. 16:16-19, Paul did not so understand it, because he disclaimed all connection with the apostles—Gal. 1:16-17; and, when he came to Jerusalem where the apostles were, and presented himself for fellowship, no one of them raised this objection; but, when Barnabas convinced them that he was a zealous worker and worshipper in the name of Jesus, they received him—Acts 9:26-30. Besides, the laying on of hands in the New Testament church had nothing to do with fellowship; but was a part of the formal ceremony for the initiation of officers and for

the dedication of workers to their task—Acts 6:1-6; 13:1; II Tim. 1:6. Those upon whom hands were laid were in every case already in the fellowship of the church.

Also, baptism is a serious hindrance to fellowship to-day, which raises another old unsettled and disturbing question which, like the ghost of Banquo in the fellowship of churches, will not down; yet discussion of this question is futile, otherwise discussion would have settled it long ago. It was not an issue in the early church. It was not mentioned by the apostles and Barnabas, when Paul presented himself for fellowship. It is true that Paul had been baptized, but Barnabas did not even mention this fact in urging his reception by the apostles but only that he had seen the Lord at Damascus, and he had spoken to him, and that he was a bold and diligent preacher in the name of Jesus, which was according to what Jesus had taught. He did not say, where two or three that have been baptized gather together in his name, as many to-day require for their fellowship. Baptism was not then regarded as an initiation or door in the fellowship of the local body, as Baptists and Disciples to-day make it; but it was for the remission of sins—Acts 2:38; Mark 16:16—and to put one "into Christ," or his "one body," the universal spiritual church of Christ—Gal. 3:27; I Cor. 12:13. No passage in the New Testament refers to or connects baptism with the local body. The fellowship of the local body was not limited by any ordinance or sacrament, but by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ alone, that is, it was open to all that desired to work and worship in the name of Jesus. But is it not a fact that all in the fellowship of the local body had been baptized? The

New Testament nowhere says so, nor can this be inferred from anything that it does say. In fact, the inference is strong that the original one hundred and twenty in the first church in Jerusalem had not been baptized. But whether they had or had not been baptized has nothing to do with Christian fellowship, because, as we have shown, baptism had no reference or meaning to the local body. This body was composed of all those that "gather together in the name of Jesus" according to Jesus, or that "call on the name of the Lord" according to Paul.

But can one be in the fellowship of the local body, and not in Christ, or his spiritual body, into which baptism puts one? Yes, Simon the sorcerer, the fornicator of I Cor. 5, Jezebel of Thyatira, etc., were, and there are many such to-day in the fellowship of the local bodies, and many of them have been baptized. Close fellowship on baptism does not keep such out of the local body; nor will any other formal test keep such out; but such are not in Christ, that is, saved. He adds the saved to his spiritual church—Acts 2:47; and he and he alone knows those that are saved. "The Lord knoweth them that are his," says Paul, so Paul and all the other apostles left salvation and church membership in the hands of the Lord alone; but they received into the fellowship of the local body all those that desired to work and worship in the name of Jesus. The local body was never intended to be an inquisitorial body to sit in judgment on the salvation and orthodoxy of its members, but for Christian work and worship in the name of Jesus. As to the unworthy that come in, Paul required that "every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness," but at the same

time he pleads for patience and charity for these "vessels of dishonor" thus: "Now in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some unto honor and some unto dishonor. If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be vessel unto honor, sanctified, meet for the master's use, prepared unto every good work." So the greatest forbearance and tolerance should be shown toward the unworthy of the local body; and those of the local body should be very slow to withdraw fellowship even from the vessels unto dishonor. The church was intended to be a refuge and saving station for all such lost souls.

Furthermore, the fellowship of the local body was not limited by the vote of the congregation or the session, as is the case in some churches to-day. There was no such vote in the apostolic church. If such votes are taken to-day, the voting should be according to the terms of fellowship, given by Jesus, as follows: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst." If the fellowship of the church is to be Christian, it must be at least as broad and inclusive as the fellowship of Christ himself. But Jesus and his apostles were too broad and unsectarian for the denominational churches of to-day, so denominational creeds and sectarian shibboleths have been placed at the entrances of the respective denominations, thereby restricting the fellowship of the same. Many of these creeds are not written but none-the-less binding; and the shibboleths, which are the slogans of doctrines, and the denominational terms, the meaning of which are known only to the initiates, determine fellowship. In many cases the differences between the churches are merely differences of terminology, but nevertheless

barriers to fellowship. All such bear the denominational stamp, and determine the fellowship of the denomination that holds them. They have no use or meaning in the broad fellowship of Christ's universal church, and can not be held and applied in his name, which marks the boundary of truly Christian fellowship. All such denominational fellowships are sectarian circles within the circle which Jesus drew for the fellowship of his disciples, including all those that work and worship in his name.

> "He drew a circle that left me out,
> Heretic, rebel, and a thing to flout;
> But Love and I had the wit to win,
> We drew a circle that took him in."

This circle was drawn by Jesus, when he said, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst."

In conclusion, this fellowship in the name of Jesus, which he prescribed, and his first disciples followed, has continued in the church universal all through the ages, notwithstanding the many narrow denominational fellowships that have sought to displace it. In every church there has always been a large company that recognize the bond and respond to the tie that inheres in the name of Jesus Christ. It is the fellowship of Christian love and brotherhood, which Jesus lived and died to establish, and to which all his disciples, when freed from denominational prejudice and loyalties, respond. It is one of the ideals of New Testament Christianity which we have not yet been able to realize, but under the conquering, alluring name of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall realize it; and to hasten this day this article is written and sent forth.

JOHN B. COWDEN.

CAN THE SYNAGOGUE CLAIM JESUS?

A Sermon Delivered by Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, at the Temple Israel, St. Louis, Missouri, on Good Friday, April 3, 1931

THIS day the Christian world has commemorated in its institutions of worship the tragic death of the most influential Jew of history. It has relived in its memory the scenes which took place in the capital of our ancient country, prior to and including the crucifixion of Jesus by the Roman soldiery. In honor of his memory millions of Christians have this day abstained from food and thousands of others have shed copious tears over his final suffering. Whether we Jews will or not, we cannot allow this day to pass by unnoticed and we can no longer ignore the importance of the event which it commemorates. Let those who despair of the power of religion and who have abandoned the hope that the relations between Jews and Christians can ever be held on the finest plane of fellowship, ponder over the significance of this very discussion on this evening in a Jewish synagogue. Who would have thought it possible a century ago for a rabbi to stand in his synagogue on the anniversary of the death of Jesus and publicly announce that he is to discuss his place in the synagogue, without fear of any opposition or of any untoward incident to mar the occasion? Even more, who would have conceived a

century ago to-day that a Christian congregation would willingly forego a service scheduled to be held in its sanctuary, in order not to disturb the regular prayers of a Jewish congregation meeting within its walls? Such is the case with the Second Baptist Church, which was scheduled this evening to hold a Good Friday service, in conjunction with St. John's Methodist Church, in its own house of worship. In order not to interfere with the services of our sister congregation, Temple Shaare Emeth, the Baptist church agreed this year to meet at St. John's Methodist Episcopal church. Behold tonight on these corners of Kingshighway and Washington one Jewesh service in a synagogue, another Jewish congregation worshipping in a Christian shrine, and two Christian congregations observing the sanctity of this day in one of their churches. Surely the very occurrence of these events is a hopeful harbinger for the future and points to the limitless possibilities which religion can and will achieve, as through the processes of education men form those newer habits which will make their moral conduct in keeping with their religious professions.

It is needless to dwell upon the sad and tragic past which has made it impossible for the Jew throughout the ages, in view of the severity with which heresy was prosecuted by the dominant church, to discuss the life of that Jew who has influenced Jewish history, even as he has influenced the history of all humanity, in the past twenty centuries as has no other individual. Not only did the Christian church censor and destroy Jewish literature but it made any unfettered discussion of the life of Jesus impossible by Jews. The Jew, on the other

hand, knew only the suffering which he placed at the door of the church. He knew only the inquisition which tortured his sons and mutilated his daughters. He knew only the oppressive tyranny which singled him out and branded him as a pariah and an outcast in society. He knew only that his life was embittered, his spirit fettered, his body crushed, because he was a kinsman of Jesus, and in his pain and sorrow and despair he blamed his sufferings not upon the men who misunderstood the message of Jesus but upon Jesus himself. Just as the Christian world has taken vengeance upon the Jew for the crucifixion of Jesus by the Romans, so the Jewish world has taken vengeance upon Jesus for their sufferings at the hands of his followers. Especially at this season of the year was the lot of the Jew unbearable. It is one of the ironies of history that at a time when the personality of a Jew stimulated the religious sensibilities of the Christian world, that very Christian world turned with hatred and loathing upon his people. Many a pogrom was initiated on Good Friday. Many a massacre occurred on this day, when infuriated masses in Europe heard again that the Jews had killed their savior, and having no historical sense immediately sought to avenge his death. This has always been the season of pogroms and the season when anti-Jewish hostility was at its height. If Jesus had not been a Jew, all this suffering would have been spared to his people. Consequently, in the dark past, it was difficult for the Jew calmly to study and to evaluate his personality. It heralds a tremendous advance in Jewish-Christian relationship that on Good Friday such a discussion is possible.

In asking the question whether the modern synagogue can claim Jesus, is the suggestion made that the synagogue is thinking of retreating from the rigid monotheistic stand which it has firmly held throughout the centuries? Is it possible that Jews are considering, if necessary, the modification of their conception of God and to yield toward the trinitarian views which Christianity has held up for centuries? Hardly is this likely to be so at a time when many of the Christian leaders and thinkers are retreating from their trinitarian views. Each year more and more Christians are saying what the Jews have said throughout the centuries, that there can be no savior but God, that no human being can be deified, and that the historic view of suffering Israel throughout the ages that God is one is more acceptable to the modern mind than the trinitarian conception so long taught by the church. In speaking of claiming Jesus for the synagogue, there is no intention on the part of the synagogue of ascribing any divinity to him which does not inhere in every human being. The Jew is not prepared to retreat from the second commandment with its injunction, "To have no other gods besides Me." The Jew can never consent to the deification of any individual, no matter how charming his personality, no matter how beautiful his character, no matter how heroic his life, no matter how compelling his example. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord is One" will ever remain inscribed on the banners of Judaism.

When the modern Jew speaks of Jesus he does not have in mind a deified human being, nor does he have in mind the Jesus of Christian theology, the Jesus who guarantees salvation to all mankind, the Jesus whose

death was an atonement for all humanity. This is the Christ of Christianity and the Christ of Christianity the Jew cannot accept. The modern Jew in his thinking is just as far from that conception, if not farther, than he was when Paul established the Christian religion. When we speak of Jesus, we have in mind the humble Gallilean carpenter whose personality inspired love and admiration among his followers, who taught a high standard of ethics, who spent his life amongst Jews, who toiled for his people, and who came to his death almost nineteen centuries ago. By Jesus we mean the Jesus who was born in the synagogue and who never left it, the Jesus who came to fulfill its laws, the Jesus who came to Jerusalem on the eve of the Passover festival to bring his offering to the temple, as did other faithful and devout Jews, the Jesus who sat at the feet of the rabbis, who learnt from them the inimitable majesty of Jewish aspiration, the wide universalism of its teaching, the all-inclusiveness of its outlook, as well as the charm and poetry of its ritual. Truly, Jesus lived as a Jew.

Even as Jesus lived as a Jew, so did he die as a Jew. The tragic death of Jesus fits in perfectly with the historic Jewish conception of the messiah. The word "messiah" was initially applied to the kings of Israel. It means savior. It was the duty of the ancient kings of Israel to save their people from their foes. Whenever Israel lived in exile or whenever tyrants cruelly oppressed them, the people hoped and prayed for a redeemer or a messiah who would restore their national independence and who would drive out of Palestine the conqueror or the oppressor. During the cruel and bru-

tal reign of Pontius Pilate in Jerusalem, the poverty-stricken masses of that city, suffering and groaning under his brutality, were praying and hoping that God would send them a redeemer who would drive out the Roman and his legions, who would place a descendant of David on the throne of Israel, and would make possible the renewed grandeur and glory of the kingdom of Judæa. On the Passover festival, when the memories of Egyptian freedom were kindled in the minds of the Jews, the hope for the imminent coming of a messiah was in the minds of all. When Jesus, therefore, came to Jerusalem on the eve of the Passover festival and when the beautiful things he had done, exaggerated by hero-worshipping peasants and embellished by rumor, reached the ears of the Jewish masses, is it any wonder that many of them felt that the messiah had come and that the days of Roman rule were numbered? Very likely, through the Jewish friends of Pontius Pilate, the latter heard that on the eve of the festival of freedom, the Jews were heralding a man from Nazareth as the messiah. Knowing the political significance of that news, Pontius Pilate ordered the messiah apprehended, and when Jesus stands before him and refuses to deny that he was the messiah, Pontius Pilate ordered his execution, and on his cross wrote his crime, "King of the Jews." In the eyes of the Roman ruler he was a political revolutionist, a rebel who threatened the power of imperial Rome and who was executed as so many Jewish revolutionary leaders had been by Rome. Whatever in the Gospel account shifts the burden of the crucifixion from Pontius Pilate to the Jews of Jerusalem, represents merely the attempts of later writers to ab-

solve a Roman from the guilt of the crucifixion and to condemn the people of Jesus who had refused to accept the theology which gifted genius had created about him. Jesus therefore died as a Jewish patriot, regarded by the masses of Jerusalem as their champion against the oppression of Rome. In dying as a martyr his death was characteristically Jewish. Even as Jesus died at Calvary for an ideal, so have his people died on a hundred thousand Calvarys. The cross for the Jew was not merely erected at one place in Jerusalem but the cross for the Jew has been erected in many lands throughout the ages. More than any other, the Jewish people has worn the crown of martyrdom and more than any other it has seen its finest sons impaled on the cross of their idealism, dying the deaths of martyrs for the love of God and the love of man. Even as Jesus lived as a Jew, so did he die as a Jew.

Nor is the religion of Jesus alien to Judaism. The religion of Jesus was Judaism. The religion about Jesus, the religion which Paul created to propagate the Jewish conception of God and the Jewish ideals of character throughout the pagan world, was and is alien to Judaism. Paul erected a scaffolding, the theology of Christianity, on which to drape the religion of Jesus which was the religion of his people. Jesus taught the fatherhood of God. Before him a prophet had taught, "Have we not one Father; has not one God created us all?" Jesus spoke of the brotherhood of man, and a prophetic teacher had stated, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Jesus taught the golden rule, and perhaps from Hillel he had learnt "Do not do unto others what thou wouldst not have others do unto you."

When Jesus was approached by one of the scribes and asked to define the first commandment, he replied as would have any Jew throughout the ages, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," quoting again the teachings of the synagogue, the most important doctrines of Judaism, the unity of God and the brotherhood of man. But Jesus did not merely teach the spiritual essense of Judaism. He also taught the need of concrete reminders and the need of ceremonial observance. It was not Jesus but Paul who abolished the ceremonies of Israel for the Christian world. So it is that in every respect the religion which Jesus taught was Judaism, and when Christians to-day speak of Christian character they are merely referring to those ethical and spiritual notes which the Jew has founded throughout the ages.

Jesus was critical of the Jews of his age, and that again stamps him as characteristically the Jew. What Jew has not been critical of his brethren? What great Jew has not found flaws in Israel? Even Moses was angered at the people he freed and broke the ten commandments. And the prophets of Israel spared no invective in exposing the corruption, ethical and spiritual, which prevailed among their people. It is a poor teacher who only flatters his pupils and who fails to point out their deficiencies. The prophets of Israel like Jesus condemned the blind observance of ritual while the spiritual laws were ignored. Neither Jesus nor the prophets were opposed to ritual as such. They were too wise. They knew human nature too well to know that man needs tangible symbols, concrete re-

minders, and poetic formulations of his faith and ideals. They did not object to ceremonies but they did object to ceremonies which failed to convey ethical idealism or spiritual values. They objected not to the use but to the abuse of ceremonies. The Jews of Jesus' day were by no means saints, even as were the Jews of the days of the prophets. They needed men to lash them into action, to excoriate them for their sins, to quicken their consciences, and to stir their hearts. Even in his criticism of his people, Jesus was Jewish.

Who can measure the effect of his life on the destiny of his people? The Jews of the middle ages, that is, the masses, only saw its tragic effect. All they knew about Jesus was that they suffered for him. All they knew was that they were persecuted because from the ranks of their ancestors had sprung one of the great religious geniuses of all time. But the time has come when the Jew can appreciate that Jesus has done more for Israel, merely than to cause it suffering. Jesus has made of Israel a people of world importance. By his life he inspired a group of men through whom the history, the literature, the ethics, the poetry of the Jew, have been carried to the four corners of the earth. Go where you will and men will be acquainted with the minute details of the ancient history of our people, as they are acquainted with the history of no other people. No library is as widely cherished as is the library of ancient Israel—the Bible. No heroes are as universally glorified as are the heroes of Israel. No poets have received the acclaim that the Psalmists, the poets of Israel, have received. All of this glory has been due to the influence of the personality of Jesus upon his fol-

lowers. The fact that the Jew's God, his literature, his heroes, his poets, his prophets, have won the admiration of men throughout the world, the fact that more sanctuaries are named after Jews than after the members of any people, the fact that men pray through his prayers and worship according to his rules, has given the Jew a sense of pride which has enabled him to survive the very persecutions of the religion that one of his sons had made possible. Jewish history though in itself beautiful, when placed in the background of Christian development, becomes a tremendously powerful force. Through Christianity the Jew became of cosmic importance. He became a marked man, even as distinguished men are marked. The word "Jew" even though it brought suffering, became a badge of distinction; and sometimes I wonder whether envy of the Jews' kinship to Jesus was not one of the causes of the persecution at the hands of the followers of Jesus. Through Christianity, Jewish history was torn from its narrow setting in Palestine. The Jews ceased to be a petty provincial strutting upon the stage of Judæa, but marched into the theatre of world vision and became the most unique people in the history of the world. If it had not been for Christianity, we Jews might have been an insignificant sect of men, as insignificant as have been the followers of Zoroaster who had a great and noble religion and a dignified literature. But because of Christianity we have become and are a people of world importance who cannot be ignored wherever men will understand the forces which made our civilization possible. Jesus has profoundly influenced the history of his people.

Jesus has also affected profoundly the history of humanity in a Jewish way. It is true that the civilization in which we live and in which Christians predominate is not a civilization in which the ideals of the religion of Jesus, of Judaism, are predominant. It is true that if Christians had really followed Jesus there would have been no World War, there would be no racial prejudice, there would be no national arrogance, there would be no starving unemployed, there would be no crime caused by poverty, there would be no ecclesiastical hierarchies, there would be no caste system, there would be no moneyed autocracy. But though the ideals of Jesus have not been attained in society, who can deny that his personality and the Judaism which his personality emphasized, has had its effect in softening the passions of the barbarians of Europe, has helped to civilize them, and has made for much of the kindness in modern society, has made even for that spirit which makes it possible for me to stand here and freely and fearlessly to speak my convictions? And I hope the time will come when the ideals of Jesus, the ideals of the synagogue, will be regnant throughout the world. The influence of Jesus on humanity has been religious and moral, and the genius of Israel has expressed itself on religious and moral lines. Jesus' influence on mankind has been Jewish. As Christian thinking disentangles itself from the theology which served its purpose and returns more and more to the pristine beauty of the teachings of Jesus which were the teachings of the synagogue, the world will more and more approximate the ideals of which the great spirits of humanity have dreamt. It has frequently been said that the Jew seeks to conquer the

world and to dominate society. The only type of conquest and domination that the Jews desire is in the triumph of the ideals of justice and righteousness. Jesus has been a powerful factor in propagating these ideals. For like the synagogue, Jesus has taught, "Not by might nor by strength but by the Spirit of God must men conquer."

For these six reasons then the synagogue should claim Jesus. First, he lived as a Jew. Second, he died as a Jew. Third, his religion was the religion of his people, the religion of the synagogue. Fourth, his criticism of his people was Jewish and in line with the prophetic tradition. Fifth, he glorified Jewish history. And, sixth, his influence on civilization has been moral and spiritual in keeping with the Jewish genius.

Shall then the synagogue to-day not claim Jesus? a Jewish patriot who lost his life trying to rid his people of tyranny, a Jewish teacher who upheld the finest teachings of the synagogue, a Jewish critic who attacked the smugness and complacency of his day, a Jewish prophet through whom the visions of his people have become the visions of humanity, a Jewish personality whose influence has expressed the religious and the moral genius of his people. What of it that we suffered because of him? Has our suffering not been worth while? Has it not been a privilege to suffer for an ideal? Is it not to the glory of the Jew that he has a martyred history? What of it if there are Christians who still hate us? What of it if there are those who honor Jesus and loathe his people? What of it if ecclesiastics still in his name turn the mobs against us? Shall we not be just to the memory of Jesus even though his followers are

unjust to us? Even though ill will continues, even though malice has not disappeared, I would plead with my people to recognize the Jewishness of Jesus and his rightful place to a claim in the Jewish roll of honor. I do believe that his teachings should be read in the synagogue, not that we accept all of his teachings, any more than we do not accept all the teachings of Amos, nor all the teachings of Jeremiah, nor all the teachings of Moses. I think the time has come when we Jews can acclaim one of our greatest sons, through whom we have suffered but through whom also we have been glorified. Even if the mobs begin to howl and to clamor against us, even if the tide of hatred were to rise, even if pogroms and massacres were to be reenacted, even if the Christian world should continue to heap its injustice upon the people of Jesus, I would yet plead with my people because of their religious and moral passions and because of their distinctive spiritual genius, not to yield to prejudice or to passion but calmly to essay the Jewishness and the glory of Jesus, and to recognize him as a noble product of the religious culture of Israel.

FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

Anglicans Discuss Whether Non-conformist Shall Be Allowed to Come to Their Celebration of the Lord's Supper

To many people who pray for the good estate of the catholic church, not as an end in itself but as the instrument for promoting the kingdom of God on earth, the reports of the proceedings in the Lower House of the convocation of Canterbury recently must have offered very sad reading. The Lower House—i.e. the general body of the clergy of the southern province—had before it for consideration the recommendation of the Lambeth Conference that in certain strictly-defined circumstances Nonconformists should be admitted to holy communion in Anglican churches. We are not aware of any demand by Nonconformists for this privilege of occasional conformity. The gesture, to use the word by which it was described in convocation, came spontaneously from the bishops. Certainly there was nothing revolutionary in the proposal. At one time in their history Nonconformists were actually penalized for not attending holy communion in Anglican churches. Indeed, as the bishop of Chelmsford has shown in a striking letter to *The Times*, enforced conformity was the policy which both church and state adopted toward dissenters. "To refuse to go to communion in the parish church was an offense against the church and disabled all who absented themselves from holding any public office." Neither baptism nor confirmation was insisted upon preliminary to communion until the Oxford movement introduced a new spirit of

exclusiveness into the church of England. Even to-day many clergymen in the church of England have no scruples about administering holy communion to occasional conformists even when they know them to be Nonconformists.

The Lambeth conference recommendation had the double purpose of defining as well as regularizing the procedure. The bishops clearly defined the exceptional circumstances, and indicated as suitable occasions three instances:—

(1) Where a baptized communicant member of a church not in communion with our own is cut off by distance from the ministration of his own church;

(2) Baptized Nonconformists in school or college chapel; or

(3) Special occasions when members of other denominations are united with Anglicans in some form of Christian endeavor, and are in sympathy with reunion and desire the holding of a "Corporate Communion."

Over these very guarded and innocuous concessions —for which so far as we know, Nonconformists are certainly not yearning, and will not be gravely distressed if they are withheld—the clergy in the Canterbury province divided themselves into two hostile camps. Before convocation actually assembled they made war upon each other by a bombardment of pamphlets, one of which—issued by the English Church Union—was described by the dean of Winchester as "a deplorable document because the calculated attitude of seventeenth century hatred seemed to run through it." The debate in convocation was of such a character that the dean of Lincoln suggested that they should pray to be delivered from an attack of nerves. With the bishop of Chelmsford, in his letter to *The Times* on Saturday, we feel that "it is difficult to decide whether the scant charity of those who oppose the proposals or the curious unhistorical basis of their argument is the more surprising."

From two speeches in the convocation discussion we extract two passages, and for convenience of comparison we place them in parallel columns:—

I was a young and zealous priest, very jealous for the rubrics. There came to my parish an old retired congregational minister. There was no Nonconformist church within several miles, and he asked me if I would administer communion to him because he thought he was not long for this world. I refused his request. Now I recognize that my action was unkind, uncharitable and cruel —*Rev. R. J. E. Boggis, of Exeter.*

I was vicar of a village in Derbyshire, where a Nonconformist chapel had to close. The congregation asked if I would receive them in communion. I said I was unable to allow it because of the rubric, but I consulted my bishop. I shall always revere him, because he informed me that in the circumstances I might agree to the request, and these people became members of my church.—*Ven. E. Hacking, Archdeacon of Newark.*

It is quite superfluous to emphasize the apparent contrast in the motives actuating these speeches; nor is it necessary even to differentiate between the Christian penitence which marks the one and the gloating proselytism that distinguishes the other.

The tempestuous battle in convocation swayed around a rubric in the Prayer Book which lays it down that no one shall be admitted to the holy communion "until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed." The voting indicates that the forces were equally divided, for eventually, by a bare majority of one, the archbishop of Canterbury's consent was sought (and, of course, given) for the adjournment of the debate to the next group of sessions in the hope that in the intervening months a special committee, representing the various points of view, will be able to present "a unanimous or nearly unanimous" report. And there the matter rests. And there, in our view, it might be permitted to rest. The discussion in convocation has completely destroyed any grace there

may have been in the Lambeth Palace recommendation. Whatever may be the ultimate decision of convocation, it is certain that any self-respecting Free churchman will have doubt, hesitation and pain in approaching the Lord's table in an Episcopal church now that it has been made patent that half the representative clergy in the Canterbury province are deliberately bent on denying him access even in extreme circumstances.

[From *The Christian World*, London.]

Eastern Orthodox Holds Mother of God Dogma, But Balks at Papal Supremacy

Vatican City.—The Agenzia d' Atene, a Greek news agency, has released the reply of the Greek Orthodox church to the recent papal encyclical, "Lux Veritatis."

With regard to the coëxistence of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ, and the doctrine of the mother of God, the Agenzia d' Atene reports the two churches to be in perfect accord, but not with regard to the primacy of the Roman pontiff.

To this proposition, the agency states, "the Orthodox church says—as specified in the official bulletin of the church of Greece—that it is ready to recognize this primacy in the form in which it was recognized in the person of Celestine." Celestine, the article declares, did not pretend to govern the church since he did not consider as under his jurisdiction "the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch or the pope of Alexandria." The council of Ephesus, the agency adds, placed on the same footing the pontiffs of Rome and Alexandria. It then quotes: "The faith of the council and of the universe is one in Celestine and in Cyril."

In replying to this stand of the Greek church, *L'Osservatore Romano* directs attention to a series of articles by Grumel which appeared in the July, August,

and September (1931) issues of *Echos d'Orient* under the title, "The Pope and the Council," and reiterates the evidence presented there and in the encyclical itself in support of the western doctrine of the primacy of the Roman pontiff.

When the idea of the council of Ephesus first arose, *L'Osservatore* points out, Pope Celestine was preoccupied with the Nestorian controversy, a full report having been sent him by Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria. A verdict without appeal was decided upon in a Roman synod and merely the execution of it assigned to the patriarch of Alexandria. The fact that this verdict was without appeal is given in answer to the argument of the Eastern church that the Roman pontiff submitted his decision on Nestorius to the council of Ephesus. The fact that Cyril forwarded the matter to the holy see indicates, it was pointed out, that he was following an established custom. The right of the holy see to pass judgment on Nestorius is further evinced in the action of his friend, John of Antioch, who urged Nestorius to submit, the article adds.

When the Emperor Theodosius II summoned the general council to meet at Ephesus, Cyril's mandate as patriarch of Alexandria was confirmed by Pope Celestine, who sent three special legates to act with Cyril, to see that the sentence of Rome was executed and to protect the authority of the apostolic see, it was noted.

There seems to be no question as to the council's recognition of Celestine as the successor of Peter and the head of the Catholic church, *L'Osservatore* continues, since: The acts of the council in proceeding against Nestorius were backed up by canonical law and the letters of Pope Celestine; Firmus, bishop of Cæsarea, declared that the bishops proceeded against Nestorius in obedience to the holy see in the execution of its decree; and the council acclaimed the famous words of Philip, one of the three papal legates, which were accepted by

the council and afterwards incorporated in the dogmatic constitution of the Vatican council, Pastor Aeternus: "No one doubts, nay for centuries it has been known that the holy and most blessed Peter, prince and head of the apostles, column of faith, and foundation of the Catholic church, received from our Lord Jesus Christ, Savior and Redeemer of the human race, the keys of the kingdom, that the power of binding and loosing sins was given to him; that up till now and forever he lives in his successors and exercises judgment."

The acts of the council were approved by Pope Celestine, but only up to a certain point—the excommunication of Nestorius, but not of his associates—which is proof in itself of the sovereignty of the Roman pontiff, the article adds.

L'Osservatore feels that if "our dissident brethren are willing to recognize in the papacy the post which in the fifth century church was occupied by Celestine, there is not only a basis for future union, but the union is accomplished."

[From *The Roman Catholic Register*, Denver, Colo.]

An Archbishop Asks the Pope for a New Test in Christian Unity

The recent encyclical "Lux Veritates," issued by Pope Pius XI, head of the great Roman church, I have read with close attention and profound interest and appreciation. As an Eastern Orthodox Catholic, I am one of those especially interested and more particularly called by this solicitous invitation addressed to "Eastern-Orthodox and other Christian bodies," asking that they surrender their ancient positions and place themselves under the assertedly sole and supreme authority of the bishop of Rome and submit to his guidance, since 1870 claimed to be infallible. The invitation is kindly and

diplomatically meant, but I regret to see that the Roman pontiff does not hesitate to call "schismatic" those Eastern Orthodox Catholics whose origin and authority in Christian history antedate the first Syrian, Palestinian, and Greek Christian missions to the Italian peninsula from which, by political accident and design, there later developed the powerful Roman church over which Pope Pius XI presides to-day. For these ancient Eastern Catholic churches the much-desired unity can never be a "return" to Rome for Rome herself is at the most their younger sister in the family of Christian and Catholic foundations and more accurately should be called a daughter of the Eastern Orthodox Catholic churches. For us of Eastern Christianity, Catholic unity is not a matter of submission to power or of the rendering of obedience claimed by the Roman church, but rather a matter of the heart and spirit and humble obedience to the will of Jesus Christ in which alone we find our power and acknowledge a true supremacy and infallibility with love and sincere Christian brotherhood.

In recent years I have read with great interest those Christian religious periodicals which are counted the mouth-pieces of the Roman Catholic, Anglican and Protestant Episcopal, and Eastern Orthodox Catholic churches, and many others. Frequently there has appeared an article or pronouncement by a pope, patriarch, cardinal, archbishop or bishop, or some other representative religious leader who has expressed a very marked and gratifying spiritual awakening which deeply impressed me. It is remarkable that every one of these writers, regardless of their office or title and notwithstanding their diversity of doctrines and ways of worship, are conscious of the "wrath of God upon the children of unbelief" (Eph. 5:6). All of them realize that the spirit of atheism and materialistic unbelief, like an all-embracing ocean wave, is encircling the world and spreading among all classes, even among those who

once by word of mouth professed to believe in and follow the Lord Jesus Christ.

This general realization of the danger of an all-engulfing atheism has been forced upon the thinking Christian leaders by recent and continuing events in nations all over the so-called Christian world, for example; Mexico, Spain, Russia. Especially in the vast country of Russia, supposedly Christian, with its immense Christian population, recent years have witnessed a sudden overturn followed by a growing hostility of the civil authorities against the church and its leaders. So fixed and determined has this civil opposition to religion become in Russia that it has now developed a philosophic and cultural as well as political basis for society avowedly atheistic, and world-wide in its very careful and deliberate program. This challenge to their very existence made clergy everywhere feel the peril which threatened them and aroused to violent efforts and protestations the leaders in all Europe and America.

Driven by the necessity of a common defense, the Christian leaders have preached unity in order to resist the spirit of the world rather than to obey the Spirit of Christ. They have called the world to stage demonstrations and issue protests and denunciations against the Bolsheviks, atheists and atheism rather than to penitently return to the way and the truth and the life and love that is Jesus Christ. They have set days and appointed times and prayers thinking to offer these to the throne of God in the Highest, asking that he calm his anger and lift his divine wrath from his people; but they forget or pretend to forget that they themselves, through the hypocrisy of their lives and services which contravenes the law of Christ have incurred the just indignation and righteous wrath of God upon the world and the church.

With this in mind I read the latest invitation of the pope of Rome and the comments upon it by the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of New York, the Ortho-

dox Catholic exarch of Western Europe, and the presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal church in America and found them all filled with courtesy and kindness. But I found, also, that each one of them was defending his own position and church by arming himself with the words of our heavenly Master, Jesus Christ, yet not showing that he meant the spirit rather than the letter of that word. All of them sit in seats of power, of influence, and of wealth by reason of which their word commands attention and they dominate beyond the sphere of those who acknowledge their authority. But, "not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." Only in Bishop Perry's remarks is there the suggestion of the spirit behind the letter. He alone intimates that the source of the difficulty is our own sin. And this is exactly the point that I would stress. All our divisions, all the atheism and unbelief, all moral and spiritual depression (and equally economic depression), are the direct and natural consequence of the sin which dwells within us and which we consciously and voluntarily exercise. Penitence for that sinfulness, and a rebuilding of life in the spirit of Jesus Christ rather than fighting with his words is the only cure.

Therefore, though I am a bishop in the Orthodox Catholic church, I speak not by the power of the apostolic succession which I received, nor by the holy doctrines, traditions, and dogmas which my church preserves, nor yet by a power of temporal and spiritual authority which the bishop of Old Rome and the bishop of Constantinople (New Rome) especially claim, nor through the power of influence and wealth of the archbishop of Canterbury and the presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal church in America. The authority with which I speak is that only of the power of growth and development in the spirit of Jesus Christ and the right of existence of the youngest of the Orthodox churches—The Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic

church in North America, over which by the grace of God I preside, and which, through his guidance, I conduct and serve in his Spirit.

Those in exalted seats, dominating by power, by influence, and by wealth, in Old Rome and in New Rome, in Alexandria, and in Canterbury, in the cathedral of Saint John the Divine in New York, wherever there is any bishop claiming hierarchical authority, I address my brethren. Not with a royal robe of temporal power, not with the costly ornamented vestments of hierarchy, not with the scarlet cloak and velvet garments do I address my brethren; but by the living word of God and through his animating Spirit I call to them.

I beseech all these my brethren to turn to the sacred book wherein, by the Spirit of God we can understand his word and find the source of that allusion made by Bishop Perry, that our sin alone is the cause of God's wrath upon the world. We must also realize that this wrath and indignation against us and against the world will not be lifted, nor will the fear and dread in our hearts be removed, unless and until we, who sit in old and new Rome, in Alexandria, and Canterbury, in every place and on every seat of authority, go back humbly, one and all, to the manger, to the cave, to the garden; unless we pause for a moment on the mount where our heavenly Master gave his disciples and the distracted world his eternal sermon; unless we repeat and show forth in ourselves, with hearts flooded with his Spirit, the warnings and teachings of that sermon. We must sit together with each other and with our Lord in that upper room as he sat with his disciples and there learn the lesson of his washing of their feet; that real glory is the fruit only of profound humiliation of self. We must go on from there to Calvary carrying our cross with serenity of spirit so that we may be lifted upon it in a victory of self-surrender. Then we shall be able to

repeat the words of Our Lord: "Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world" (John 16:33); and end our journey of real service and sacrifice by singing his triumphant anthem: "It is finished" (John 19:30).

Yea, only with the abdication of magnificent palaces, only with the casting aside of the velvet vestments, only by deserting the vast tables of the rich food and drink, only when we learn to be content with simplicity and truth will we be able to wear the garment of the comforting spirit of truth and righteousness and feed our souls on the living bread of heaven. Only by self-denial and the endurance of the might of the cross following the steps of the Master can we draw closer to him and unite ourselves with his Spirit. Only through the humiliation of ourselves, by subduing our worldly desires, by acknowledging him by our lives rather than words to be the sole Redeemer of mankind shall we be united to him and grow in his Spirit so that, with broken, humble, humiliated hearts we shall do his will and unite ourselves in him.

Not until then can we complete our work following his new commandment: "Love one another!" And then there shall be no need for the conferences such as Lambeth, Lausanne, Mount Athos, and Velchard or of encyclicals and replies. "For the kingdom of God is not in words, but in power." I Cor. 4:20.

[From Archbishop Aftemois of the Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic church in North America, 345 State Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.]

A Protestant Response to the Pope's Invitation

Special to The New York Times.

Baltimore, Md., Jan. 23.—An assurance that if Pope Pius XI will appoint a commission of Roman Catholics, an equal number of Protestants "foremost in scholarship

and friendly attitudes" will be appointed by the Christian Unity League "to confer over the points that divide us" is on its way to the Vatican from the Rev. Dr. Peter Ainslie of this city. He wrote the letter as chairman of the Continuation Committee of the Christian Unity League, which has a membership of some thousands.

Dr. Ainslie, who is editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly,* with offices also in New York, London and Tokyo, wrote the letter under date of Thursday and made it public to-day. He closed by saying that with great respect he awaited "the reply of your Holiness."

Dr. Ainslie said that writing books would not bring about a union of Christendom but that there must be a meeting "face to face" of Roman Catholic authorities with brethren of the other branches of the Christian church, "separated brethren, to use the phrase of your Holiness."

Leaders of the Protestant Episcopal, Lutheran and Methodist Episcopal churches have made declarations as to why their respective communions cannot accept the invitation of the pontiff in his recent encyclical "Lux Veritatis" to "return to us." The letter of Dr. Ainslie is believed to be the first definite step taken to bring some action out of the pope's appeal.

The Ainslie letter reads as follows:

His Holiness
Pope Pius XI
Venerable Father:

Many Protestants have read the official summary of your encyclical letter, "Lux Veritatis," with interest because of your expressed concern in a united Christendom. We recognize the antiquity and service of the Catholic church through the centuries, and in many instances we have been helped by Catholic learning and Catholic piety. Some of us have not hesitated to go to

the defense of our Catholic brethren when they have been attacked by anti-Catholic organizations. So that in approaching your holiness in response to your encyclical letter, I wish to affirm my friendly attitude of mind both toward you and toward the church over which you preside.

Some of us, who watch for every indication of reconciliation in the divided church of our Lord, would consider ourselves unfaithful to this larger interest and discourteous to your holiness were we to allow your recent encyclical letter to pass without an expression from us of more than ordinary interest and, at the same time, to assure you of our willingness to meet those of your choice with whom we may hold friendly conference.

We realize, as your holiness does, that a divided church, with such barriers as prevent us meeting as brethren to confer relative to reconciliation, is altogether an improper state of affairs, particularly in the church of Christ. Many of us have read widely of Catholic literature and some Catholics have read perhaps, equally as widely of our Protestant literature, but we can never be reconciled on the basis of each other's books, however excellent these may be. We must meet face to face, sit together as brethren, "separated brethren," to use the phrase of your holiness, and there hold friendly conference until we come to appreciate that which is appreciated and start building up an understanding between ourselves which has been denied both to Catholics and to Protestants because we have lived apart as though there were no common ties which bind us together around our common Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It is because we are brethren that our divisions have become the scandal of history.

"Therefore, as chairman of the continuation committee of the Christian Unity League, composed of thousands of the free and unafraid in all the com-

munions of American Protestantism, who stand for the equality of all Christians before God, I gladly assure your holiness that on the appointment of a commission of Catholics, fifteen or twenty, or such number as you may desire, an equal number of Protestants, foremost in scholarship and friendly attitudes, such as compose the Christian Unity League, will be appointed—not to debate and argue, but to confer over the points that divide us—in order that we of this day may make some contribution toward reconciliation in the divided and unreconciled house of our Lord, if not to be consummated in our day, perhaps opening the way now in order to be consummated in the succeeding generation.

"It is unnecessary to remind your holiness of the advances that are now being made among the political governments of the world for understanding and coöperation, but I refer to this only to emphasize the urgency of the getting together of Christians in some appearance of brotherhood in order to help a situation that is so grave in the spiritual life of the world.

"With great respect, I await the reply of your holiness.

"Your brother in Christ,

"PETER AINSLIE."

[Many letters have come to the office from Catholics and Protestants in consequence of the above letter. From these letters three questions have come. One question was, Has his holiness answered? The answer is No. Another question was, Do you expect him to answer? The answer is Yes, not necessarily from him personally but from some of his secretarial force. Sincerity always expects sincerity of others. The letter was a sincere approach to what the author believed was a sincere statement. There was not the slightest desire to make it awkward for his holiness which the unanswered letter has done. Perhaps he is so accustomed to assaults of Protestants on Catholics and of Catholics on Protestants that this letter left him in an uncertain mind. Let us think this. The other question was, Do you believe Jesus would have answered such a letter when he was on earth in the flesh? The answer is Yes, undoubtedly yes. He would have sat in person with us. He could not have been the revealer of God unless he had responded to sincerity, however ignorant and stumbling it may have been.—The Editor.]

It was the Christian Unity League which, a few years ago in New York, arranged for the Rev. Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, president of Union Theological Seminary, a Presbyterian, to celebrate the Holy Communion in St. George's Protestant Episcopal church.

When the Right Rev. William T. Manning, bishop of the Protestant Episcopal diocese of New York, learned of this, he "admonished" the Rev. Dr. Karl Reiland, the rector and the vestry of St. George's not to permit any one, not episcopally ordained, to officiate at an Episcopal altar, pointing out that it was against the canons of the Episcopal church.

Thereupon the interdenominational communion servce was transferred to the chapel of Union Theological Seminary, where Dr. Coffin officiated.

[From The New York *Times*.]

Catholics Refuse Conference Because They Regard Other Christians as Brothers of Annas and Not of Jesus!

Pointing out that the Catholic church could not take part in many of the conferences held to discuss Christian unity because, in so doing, she would be required to abandon her claim to divinity, Father Sheen asserted that Christ himself, in "the world's first church conference," refused "to enter into discussion, to sit down to a conference on the all-important questions of religion, ministry and discipline" with the high priest Annas. "He refused in words," Father Sheen said, "which left no doubt in the mind of Annas that the doctrine which he preached was the one which he would now uphold in religious conference, namely, his divinity. With words cut like the facets of a diamond, with sentences as uncompromising as a two-edged sword, he answered Annas: 'I have spoken openly to the world . . . and in secret I have spoken nothing. Why asketh

thou me? Ask them who have heard what I spoke unto them: Behold they know what things I have said.' "

"Some brute standing nearby," Dr. Sheen continued, "feeling himself the humiliation of the high priest at such an uncompromising response, struck our blessed Lord across the face with a mailed fist, drawing out of him two things: blood, and a soft answer: 'If I have spoken evil, give testimony of the evil: but if well, why smitest thou me?' That soldier of the court of Annas has gone down in history as the representative of that great group who feel an intense hatred against divinity, but who never clothe it in intellectual language, but in violence alone.

"All that happens in the life of Christ happens in the life of the church. Here in the courtroom of Annas I find the reason for the Catholic church's attitude in refusing to take part in movements for federation such as those inspired by present world conferences on religion. . . . In so many words the church says to those who invite her: 'Why askest thou me about my doctrine and my ministry? Ask them that have heard me. I have spoken openly through the centuries, declaring myself the spouse of Christ, founded on the Rock of Peter. Ask those who have heard me. . . . I know that you will welcome me to your conferences if I say that I am not divine; I know ritualists throughout the world feel the need of my ceremonials, and would grasp my hand if I would but relinquish my claim to be divine. . . . I know the church doors of the world would rejoice to see me pass in. I know your welcome would be sincere. I know you desire the union of Christendom —but I cannot! "Why do you ask me?" If your first principle is that I am not divine, but just a human organization like your own, that I am a human institution like all other human institutions founded by erring men and erring women; if your first principle is that I am human, not divine, then there is not common ground for conference. I must refuse.' "

[From *The Roman Catholic Register,* Denver, Colo.]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dr. Willett's Article one of the Best that has appeared in recent years.

Editor The Christian Union Quarterly,

SIR: I have read with pleasure Dr. Herbert L. Willett's article "The Jews and Christians" which appeared in *The Christian Union Quarterly* of January. It is a well informed, fair, and sympathetic statement of the position of the Jew in the modern world.

I am afraid that Dr. Willett has under-stated the problem of anti-Jewish prejudice to-day. There has been a rising tide of anti-Jewish sentiment throughout the Western World, as well as in the United States. In Eastern Europe and in Germany to-day it has taken on menacing proportions. The German youth is being indoctrinated with a medieval anti-Jewish ideology and the Jews of Poland, Roumania, Hungary, and Austria are being hedged in with economic, political, and educational disabilities.

The situation in the United States, as far as the growing discrimination against Jews in the economic life of the country and in the professional and educational life is concerned, is becoming increasingly more serious. I have been critical of "The Committee of Good-will between Jews and Christians" because it has not faced the realities quite squarely and has concerned itself almost entirely with ideal abstractions on which nearly everyone can agree and ignored the troublesome, concrete facts which impinge upon life and control action.

I believe too, that Dr. Willett has under-estimated the importance of the Zionist Movement in the modern Jewish world and over-estimated the significance of Jesus' life and ideals as a possible meeting place in the future of Jew and Christian. Jesus can never occupy that position of centrality in the thinking of Jews that he has in the minds of Christians. Beyond a full measure of respect for him, as one of a group of great Jewish teachers, the Jewish mind is not likely to go.

All this, of course, is intended not in any way to detract from the very admirable summary of a very involved and difficult

problem which Dr. Willett has presented. His article and J. P. Parkes' *Jew and His Neighbor* are the two best things that I have seen on the subject in recent years.

ABBA HILLEL SILVER

The Temple,
Cleveland, Ohio

Dr. Willett's Extraordinary Piece of Work.

Editor The Christian Union Quarterly,

SIR: Dr. Willett's article "The Jews and Christians" in the January number of *The Christian Union Quarterly* is an extraordinary piece of work. He shows not only an intelligent comprehension of the Jewish scene, its divisions, motivations, and problems, but, which is more unusual and commendable, a profound apprehension of Jewish spiritual values. I was particularly interested in his forthright statement, "The best religious service which a Christian can render a Jew is to encourage him in loyalty to his ancestral faith. There is far greater value both to the individual and to society . . . than in the transfer of men and women from the one confession to the other." A statement such as this is healthy antidote for that numerous company of Christians who are bent on converting the Jew and for that equally numerous company of Jews who view with suspicion any move toward good-will made by Christians.

I await the publication of the entire volume with keen interest.

MORRIS S. LAZARON

Madison Ave. Temple,
Baltimore, Md.

BOOK REVIEWS

CHRISTIAN LIBERTY AND CHURCH UNITY. By M. G. G. Scherer, Secretary of the United Lutheran Church in America and Member of the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company; 204 pages; price $1.75.

Since the publication of this book Dr. Scherer has passed from us. For years he has been deeply interested in a united Christendom and this book is the mature thought of a fine soul that yearned for better conditions in our divided Christendom. It is a genuinely Protestant contribution, if one might not say a genuinely Lutheran contribution. It brings us face to face with those great ideas that Luther rescued in the uncertain and tragic days of the beginning of the Protestant reformation. The first half of the book is devoted to the discussion of Christian liberty. There can be no finer approach than by this route. It is in keeping with these times. Whether considered politically or economically, liberty is being discussed around the world. Dr. Scherer writes out of the background of the Protestant reformation and brings to the front the issues that gave that reformation its being. He says, "Among the forces which combined to neutralize the principle of Christian liberty and to enmesh the whole of life in a system of legalism were the doctrine of priesthood, the hierarchy, the papacy, monasticism, penance, purgatory, masses, and the whole conception of salvation for man by his own works and satisfactions."

He defines Christian liberty as a life or a real Christian, "real" not to be implied as perfect, but as "a new creature" being born of the Spirit. He maintains that Christian liberty is the liberty of the grace of God, that is free, not obtained by the prowess of man or the payment of any price, but is God given, a gift bestowed upon man "without any merit or worthiness." He thinks Calvin obscured the principle of Christian liberty in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* in his emphasis on the sovereignty of God and the Scriptures as the law-book of the Sovereign, but he excuses the great reformer on the ground of dyspepsia from which he suffered con-

stantly. But this did not prevent Calvin's escape from an austere and somber type of religion. Dr. Scherer contends that Christian liberty behaves fraternally, socially, obligingly, truthfully, confidingly, tolerantly, unselfishly, and imperfectly.

In his discussion he dissents from the term re-union as though once there was a golden age when the church moved in perfect harmony. He says, "It is impossible to conceive the harm that has been done to the cause of Christianity by the dissension and strife that have filled the centuries and of which every land, every city, and many congregations are painfully aware to-day." But, as an ideal, Christian unity is something to be striven after always in the midst of an ever changing order. Christ is the great magnet. Unity is a free gift—a status or relationship to Christ into which believers are received through their faith and which abides as long as they abide in Christ. It is this that establishes the likemindedness. He maintains that the inner unity must be sought first as the basis of organic union; also that the Old Testament passed away with all of its sacrifices and priesthood—from these things Christ set us free, organization being a free and natural growth suggested and conditioned by circumstances and needs. He argues at length and clearly against apostolic succession, giving James, the brother of Jesus, a place of prominence because of his zeal for the law. He finds no evidence of a complete church order with James as bishop and with presbyters and deacons under him. In Antioch there were "prophets and teachers." He regards the doctrine of the priesthood as an indispensable intermediary between God and his people as "the very head and front" of offense against Christian liberty, "certainly it is not found anywhere in the New Testament," having its beginning in the Old Testament when they took the name eucharist for the Lord's supper. He gaves a similar treatment to the term catholicity, maintaining that "unity and catholicity as attributes of the church pertain first of all to the realm of the spirit." Dr. Scherer has done a valuable piece of work in presenting this book to the public. It sets forth clearly how a Lutheran looks upon Christian unity and, in the main, most Protestants. If the other schools of Christendom would present a similar presentation we might be able to get somewhere. This would be a good service for the World Conference on Faith and Order.

KARL BARTH, THE PROPHET OF APOCALYPSE—*Der Weg der dialektischen Theologie durch die kirchliche Welt.* By Adolph Keller, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, München: 205 pages; price R.M. 3.80.

When the Acts of Apostles was written the early church had already become successful enough to have a reading public large enough to justify the publication of its history. In fact no one is interested in the history of a movement until it has already made its place in the world. Such is the case of the movement led by Karl Barth, known as the theology of crisis or the dialectical theology. The present volume does not purport to be an actual history of the movement, although it is the first step in that direction. The author's object is in fact to survey the religious condition of the Christian world by using the reaction to this theology in the different countries as his yardstick. It was an interesting objective and the author's wide personal acquaintance and experience with the churches on the international scene eminently fit him for the task. The book is readable and instructive. The catholicity of spirit makes the book an evidence of the larger type of fellowship which has already made its place in the Christianity of our time.

This movement began in Switzerland. Barth, Brunner, and Thurneysen are Swiss, although Barth was early lost to Germany, first to Göttingen, then to Münster, and now to Bonn. Gogarten and Bultmann are Germans. However, great inspiration has also been drawn from the writings of the Russian Dotojevski and the Danish Kierkegaard. It was my great pleasure to spend a few weeks, altogether too few, in the classes of Barth in Münster in 1927.

The theology takes its name, on the one hand, from Barth's love of paradox and dialectic in expressing the "infinite qualitative difference between man and God." On the other, from his presentation of religion as the crisis or judgment of God upon every undertaking, both religious and secular, of human power, pride and intelligence. He repudiates religion which is based upon attainments of the human intellect, mystical experience or ethics. He repudiates whatever begins with man. He begins and ends with the transcendent God who has revealed himself to man. Relative historical study, comparative religion and the psychology of religion are utterly repudiated. His theology deals in absolute categories. Likewise he repudiates the missionary enterprise and the ecumenical

movement as expressions of human pride and efforts of men to build a tower of Babel. The human being finds salvation only when he realizes once and for all that he is forever lost and throws himself in despair at the foot of the cross.

To an American reader, this movement obviously has definite affinities with our own Fundamentalism. But basically there is a great difference. Whereas the theology of crisis is a resurgence of a Calvanistic type of orthodoxy, it represents a radical critical position with reference to the Bible which has scarcely been equaled by any other school of German theology. Here it differs utterly from American Fundamentalism.

In my opinion the great success of this movement is due to its voice of positive certainty about God in the midst of the relativity of our time and to its expression of the disillusionment of the generation which suffered in and after the war—and still suffers. It represents a loss of confidence in the objective validity of human undertakings and in the power of man to build the kingdom of God in this world. The kingdom of God is not of this world. Moreover, it holds in the center of its thought the essential irrationality of religious experience. Again, it builds upon the fundamental orthodox foundation which has been gradually given up by most philosophical theology since the time of the Reformation. Here it lays hold upon an age-old heritage which is by no means dead, and stirs the heart of much of Europe with it in our time.

This survey by Dr. Keller shows that the movement has made its greatest success in German Switzerland, Germany, Holland, Denmark, and Scotland. It has not yet made much impression in France, the Latin countries, England, Sweden, Norway, or America, although it has aroused some degree of response in each of these countries. Moreover it has been shown a considerable amount of attention by Catholic theologians, who see in it a rebirth of the Reformation; and it has not been entirely unnoticed in the Greek Orthodox church.

The theology of crisis is undoubtedly the most outstanding theological development since the War, and this account of it is eminently worth the attention of those who are interested in the great religious movements of our time.

SELBY VERNON MCCASLAND.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF KARL BARTH. By John McConnachie. New York: Ray Long and Richard R. Smith; 228 pages; price $2.00.

Here is another exposition of the theology of Karl Barth which, like Adolf Keller's work, is evidence of the fact that this new theological movement has now gone far enough to be ready for a fairly objective appraisal. Dr. McConnachie is fully aware of the difficulty of his undertaking, due to the difficulty of comprehending the dialectical terminology of Barth, on the one hand, and to the fact that Barth himself has passed through a rapid development since he began his work and has not yet attained a final position on many points, on the other. Moreover, Barth does not desire to be considered apart from a movement, least of all as a finished and completed theological phenomenon. He refers to himself as a "bird in flight" and it would be a rare artist who could paint such rapid motion. But in spite of the difficulties this is an excellent and useful piece of work. The exposition appears to me well done. I too have spent some weeks in the classes of professor Barth, have had the privilege of meeting him personally in his home, both at the regular discussions to which he invites all students who desire to come each week, and also as his guest at other times. And I have read a considerable amount of what he has written. I am, therefore, in a position to appreciate this book. It has been written with ability, insight, and sympathy. It is apparent that the author is fundamentally in agreement with Barth and, just as was the case of Barth's *Römerbrief*, this book has been written with the joy of discovery.

I believe that the author correctly appraises the significance of Barth in these words: "The God of the modern man would not hurt a fly, but endures with perfect good nature the insults, indifference, opposition of his creatures. He calls for no decision, never puts a man to the test, is not even to be thought of as a person. Barth proclaims that God is sovereign, that there is such a thing as the wrath of God, and that 'it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God'." In order to do this, Barth develops his theology, not from any kind of humanistic study of history, philosophy, psychology or ethics, but from the word of God. He finds the word of God in the testimony of the church, in the Bible, and in the revelation to the individual who believes. It always proceeds from God, never from man, and is absolute.

There are clearly many points where we Americans would feel obliged to criticize, but Barth has a message for us too. We may well heed the appeal of a German writer intended for his own people quoted in this book to "take to ourselves the angry reproaches of Barth with whole-hearted earnestness, bend under his call to repentance, recognize its cutting truth, let its strong, earnest spirit blow through our souls, and not turn ourselves away from him by means of a learned critical analysis."

SELBY VERNON MCCASLAND.

THE RELIGIOUS CONTROL OF EMOTION. By Wayne Leys. New York: Ray Long and Richard R. Smith; 229 pages; price $2.00.

Here is a work on the psychology of religion which attempts not only to bring together the assured but scattered bits of religious knowledge under a single concept, i. e., the control of emotion, but also undertakes the practical task of formulating a system or technique for the use of both persons and institutions in positions of religious responsibility. It is an effort to bridge the long felt gulf between the laboratory and pastoral ministrations, to make the expert knowledge of psychologists available in a comprehensible form to the religious public as a whole. It differs from many books in the field in the fact that its author is not only a real scholar but also an active minister. It is an effort to provide scientific religion with the same dynamic which characterized the old. It points out that the new empirical type of religion is just as close to the layman's way of thinking as was the theology of the Middle Ages in its time.

Dr. Leys defines religion as the art of responding to no-response situations; the art of controlling the organic processes when they become disorganized. Emotion as here used refers not to the normal flow of feelings and affections, but to disturbances which have a disintegrating effect on personality. Religion is the art of responding to the abnormal, problematic experiences of life.

The reader may question whether this definition of religion is inclusive enough, but the exactness of the definition greatly contributes to the clarity of the discussion.

The method of the book is first to point out the sources of disintigrating experience, i. e., anger, fear, etc. These are maladjustments in health, economics and politics, sex, education and

philosophy. In the next place, the possibilities of control at the disposal of religion are pointed out. They are luck, conversion, compensation, morale and faith, leadership, introversion, etc. Lastly, there is a discussion of ways of increasing the control of emotion by making religions ethically defensible, logically valid, economically stable, æsthetically appealing, and metaphysically sound.

Dr. Leys grapples realistically with the emotional storms of life on the assumption that when these disintegrating disturbances are controlled life will again recover the balance, poise, significant quality, which is the desired goal of all normal high religion.

Regardless of the theological and psychological presuppositions which readers bring to this book, they will all find it intensely interesting and illuminating. It is lucid and comprehensible, and every page abounds in stimulating suggestions. It will be found indispensable to any intelligent person who desires a better understanding of the emotional storms which surge through himself and appear also in his fellows.

It has been a most instructive experience to me to read this book on the psychology of religion just after reviewing the two preceding volumes on the crisis theology of Karl Barth. Dr. Leys presents in a most capable and convincing manner that type of the American psycological approach to religion against which the thundering of Karl Barth is directed. Here we have the two major theories of religion which characterize our time. Barth sees this American confidence in psychology and social engineering as the child play of amateur religious *naïveté* which can never satisfy the yearning of the soul entangled in sin for an eternal refuge. Leys characterizes the apocalyptic mysticism of Barth as the tendency toward wallowing in delightful helpfulness.

Apparently we have here the radical contrast between confident optimism and hopeless pessimism, but in reality the case is not so bad. For in spite of his confidence, Leys nurses no illusion that his technique will ever establish a utopia or an absolute kingdom of God. He only lays out a program for using the possibilities which science definitely opens for the enrichment of human life, thoroughly aware of the fact that the ultimate goal will forever recede into the future. Barth and his colleagues have underestimated the profound seriousness and grasp of the intangibles which characterizes the American psychological study of religion. Barth holds that the American view represents human pride which refuses to humble itself before the mercy of God. Leys would

reply that human intelligence is the primary evidence of the mercy of God and that the religious person is divinely obligated to use it in the service of God. Moreover, Leys sees the mercy of God in those elements of nature and of the social order which support the aspirations of religious persons for a better world, and he aspires to be an intelligent coworker with God. Thus he finds room for a sane religious optimism.

On the other hand, Americans have generally misunderstood Barth. He is not essentially opposed to a cultural program. Actually he finds a large place for it. What he objects to is the identification of human culture with religion. Religion belongs to another world. It absolutely transcends all human relativity. Moreover, Barth is essentially optimistic. Apocalypticism is always optimistic. It is suffused with joy unspeakable as it awaits the breaking in of the imminent divine kingdom. One feels this warmth as he reads Barth. One cannot but be tremendously moved by it as he sits in his classes and meets him personally. In spite of the obscure dialectic which he so revels in and his repudiation of all human efforts to reach God, he speaks with all the vital assurance that ever characterizes pietistic evangelism. He has turned his back upon human relativity and fled for refuge to the authority of an absolute revelation. The American psychologist, on the other hand, turns his back upon that which upon empirical examination appears to be no revelation at all, he frankly faces the realism of his world, and confidently undertakes to find his revelation from day to day by the intelligent use of the tested means which science places in his hands.

The two approaches are utterly hostile to one another. They arise out of different social and cultural backgrounds. But they have the great element in common that each in its own way is set to the enrichment of human life. Moreover, they both witness to the vitality of the religious life in this so-called mechanistic and materialistic age.

SELBY VERNON MCCASLAND.

GOD'S WORLD. By Cornelius Howard Patton. New York: Ray Long and Richard R. Smith, Inc.; pages 134; price $1.50.

Here is a volume that is a little library of facts put together in challenging and stimulating fashion. Its very chapters command immediate hearing. Such topics as "A Shrunken World," "A

Hungry World," "An Ailing World," "A Groping World," and "A Possible World" will give some suggestion as to the general theme and the point of approach. It is essentially a missionary book but it is the book of a Christian statesman. It has very wide suggestive readings with a very full bibliography. It is the kind of volume which study classes will find both interesting and informing. It is a compendium of economic facts shot through with a gleam of hope. The subjects deal impartially with all nations and their various problems. Two chapters alone are worth the price of the book—"The Strife of Cultures" and "The Supremacy of Religion." The author's point of view should be widely inculcated. This is the kind of volume which young people especially would find interesting. It is one of the great volumes of the missionary literature of this generation.

FINIS IDLEMAN.

IT SHALL NOT BE AGAIN. By Thomas Curtis Clark. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc.; 88 pages.

Here are seventy-five beautiful poems from a pen that will always stand foremost in any study of poetry in these times. Mr. Clark has a remarkably keen poetic sense and has put this generation and succeeding generations under obligations to him. His poetry will live. In this volume sixty-six poems deal with peace and brotherhood. They are protests against the repetition of the world war. The opening poem is as follows:

"Who goes there, in the night,
Across the storm-swept plain?
We are the ghosts of a valiant war—
A million murdered men!

"Who goes there, at the dawn,
Across the sun-swept plain?
We are the hosts of those who swear:
It shall not be again."

Many of these poems will be used and reused for years to come, winning multitudes to the standard of peace and brotherhood. Seven are poems on Lincoln, prophet of peace and brotherhood. The book closes with three poems on the vision of peace and brotherhood. It is a garden of beauty, vision, and thrill. To read through this collection is a spiritual refreshment.

Is the Christian Church Necessary? By G. N. Robbins, B.Sc. London: Allen and Unwin; price 7/6.

This is a book decidedly outside the ordinary run of books, and it is the more interesting because it is produced within the environment of experimentation in the field of Christian union. Mr. Robbins is an interesting personality, who is "leader" in a rather unique Community church, which does its work in a small township on the outskirts of the great city of Birmingham, England. The church was originally Congregational, but it is now distinctly inter-denominational. But this does not mean that it is, in no sense a church; for Mr. Robbins and those in fellowship with him hold rather high views of the church. Further, every member of this community is a pacifist, and they practise a kind of community of goods, above a certain level of subsistence. They believe that private ownership of property is essential for the development of personality; but having assessed themselves at a certain standard, it then becomes their privilege to share with those who fall below this standard. It is a daring venture comparable to the kind of mutual benefit club described by Tertullian, but it is working out successfully in this village community at Warley. Mr. Robbins is "leader" of this community, but that does not mean that he does all the preaching. By no means! The pulpit is supplied by such eminent scholars as Professors C. J. Cadoux, H. G. Wood, Fearnon Halliday, C. Dodd, and Griffiths Jones, as well as others whose sympathies are with Christian Pacifism.

Mr. Robbins has written an interesting book which describes *the basic principles* upon which this venture is founded. It is obvious that he has read widely, though he does not trouble to quote much from others. He is always well informed and he makes his meaning clear. There are however places where many will feel that he has arrived at more or less orthodox conclusions far too easily; as for example when he deals with the Trinity; and there are certainly marks of the amateur all the way through. This is shown in the somewhat serious lack of arrangement in the matter, which gives the book an impression of diffuseness. The printing too leaves much to be desired. There are places where we are reminded too vividly of school text-books. But the work never lacks interest and should be read by every serious student of Christian union.

William Robinson.

TOMORROW'S FAITH. By the Rev. John Rathbone Oliver, M.D., Ph.D., Author of *Fear, Victim and Victor, Foursquare,* etc. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Company; 74 pages; price $1.00.

This is an interesting contribution from an Anglo-Catholic, giving the reasons for his Anglo-Catholicism and his expectation of its growth until it shall include the religious life of the English-speaking races in the new social and economic system of the future. The first chapter states the reason for Anglo-Catholics remaining in the Anglican or Protestant Episcopal church rather than going to Rome, although about 8,000 Anglo-Catholics go to Rome annually, according to Roman Catholic authorities. Evidently Dr. Oliver has been on the border himself so long that he has had to do some very intensive thinking, which has made this chapter the best chapter in the book. He classifies all Anglicans who go to Rome as follows: "First, those conversions that seem to have taken place from purely intellectual or spiritual difficulties, with no intermixture of personal dissatisfaction, disappointment, or failure. And secondly, those that were preceded by situations which contained in themselves the real reason for the change." He also sees another type who in middle age is obsessed by the lust for change. This half-conscious desire for some new emotional experience is often overwhelming and he sees many Anglo-Catholic priests going to Rome for a fresh experience, which Dr. Oliver claims, they do not get. When the sense of newness disappears, the "routine of life makes itself felt once more." He says: "In almost every case their acceptance of the Roman obedience has worked a definite intellectual or emotional loss."

But having said all this, he regards Rome as the center of Catholic Christian unity—an obsession, he says, that belongs only to the Western world, whereas in the East it is spoken of as the Latin church. He finds in the Eastern church the cradle of Christianity and rightly rejoices in the approaching intercommunion of Anglicans and Orthodox Christians, especially the recognition of Anglican orders by the Eastern Orthodox as of far greater historical consequence than Rome's dissent against Anglican orders. Nevertheless the burden of his discussion is Rome. While he sees her internal strife, he admires her external shell of unified dogma, her moral unity, beauty, and sanctity. He accepts the Petrine claims, "from the actual presence of St. Peter in Rome down to the primacy of the Roman apostolic see." He argues, however, against his fellow Anglo-Catholics going to Rome because it is an Italian

church, and foreign to the English speaking world, and he is unwilling to make himself a stranger to his English speaking race. To him the difficulty of Anglo-Catholics is more psychological than historical and more emotional than intellectual. It is a well written chapter with a definite leaning toward Rome and psychologically will be found helpful in increasing the number of converts from Anglicanism to Romanism.

The second chapter deals with Protestantism, which he does not think much of, and he maintains that Protestants do not think much of Protestant Episcopalians. He cites an extreme case to support his position. This citation is unfair as representing Protestantism. My own attitude toward the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States and the church of England is one of affection. There are multitudes of Protestants who have the same attitude. The case that Dr. Oliver cites is an exception. The third chapter, which he calls "a stay-at-home chapter" or, as entitled, *Professio Spei,* is so entangled in ecclesiastical millinery—fiddleback or gothic —that the opportunity to say the best things was lost. There is something to be said for Anglo-Catholicism. Dr. Oliver has said some remarkably fine things in his other books. The America Missal does not afford an opportunity to say the things that need to be said now. All the branches of Christendom have broken down and will stay broken down until there is some indication of outstretched hands of fellowship and love.

Essays On Marriage. By Frederick M. Harris. New York: Association Press; 208 pages.

This book is the result of careful thinking during the last five years of one who had been a sympathetic and effective personal counselor on marriage relations. It must be regretted that he passed away, leaving unfinished manuscripts, but Dr. Harrison S. Elliott has done a good piece of work in its editorship. There are twelve chapters. From the first which deals with "The Present Status of Marriage" to the last which deals with "The Limitation of Families and Married Happiness" all the chapters are helpful, especially "Marriage as a Partnership" and "Sexual Relationships of Marriage." The increasing number of such books indicates a growing intelligence away from ignorance and silence on one of the most vital problems that has to do with proper living. It is a good book to put in the hands of those contemplating marriage as well as those already married.

GRACE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By James Moffatt, D.D., D. Litt., Washburn Professor of Church History in Union Theological Seminary, New York. New York: Ray Long & Richard R. Smith, Inc.; 419 pages; price $3.00.

It is well that Dr. Moffatt has called us back to the significance of grace, which is so frequently mentioned in the New Testament, but is so little mentioned in these times "partly owing to dubiety about any view of the atonement which would naturally employ it, and partly because it seems to be associated with a doctrine of election which is distasteful to democratic sensibilities." It is a companion volume to his remarkable book *Love in the New Testament.* This is a recasting of the manuscript that furnished the basis of lectures at Oxford in 1912, maintaining that the mission of the Lord Jesus was a mission of grace. Paul interprets the gospel of Jesus as the transcendent will of God which meets man with gracious favor in his utter need and that of a Lord whose character and spirit in this approach are to be reproduced in measure by those who owe all to him. So Paul's interpretations receive a large consideration in this volume, which, however, are preceded by three interesting sections, one on the antecedents of grace, as seen in the Greek and Jewish vocabulary, the mystery religions, and the religious philosophy of the age, another section on Jesus and grace, and the third section on the New Testament language of grace. The closing section is entitled "after Paul," which deals with the pastoral epistles, epistles of James and Peter, grace and Gnosticism, the apocalypse, the epistle of the Hebrews, Lucan usage, Johannine literature, and a remarkable wealth of thought in the summary and conclusion. An appropriate introduction to this study is John Oman's *Grace and Personality.* This book will be read and reread for years to come, furnishing fresh and helpful thought to every student of the New Testament.

FOLLOW THOU ME. By George W. Truett, D.D., pastor of the First Baptist church, Dallas Texas. New York: Ray Long & Richard R. Smith, Inc.; 241 pages; price $2.00.

This is a volume of fifteen sermons and addresses, most of them being delivered at Baptist revival services in Nashville, Tennessee. They were taken down by a court reporter and revised by Dr. Truett. They are free, informal, direct, spiritual, and appealing. There is a beautiful spirit evident in all of them that makes them wonderfully helpful.

The Christian Union Quarterly

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND
INTERNATIONAL

Contents of
Volume XXI

JULY, 1931 TO APRIL, 1932

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Aftemios, Archbishop. An Archbishop Asks the Pope for a New Test in Christian Unity 353
Albright, Raymond W. The Common Heritage of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ and the Evangelical church 55
American Church Monthly, The. Reformed Fundamentalists and Unity 186
American Church Monthly, The. "We will not Pray with You." 185
Anglicans and Free Churchmen, The—The Guardian 148
Anglicans and the Old Catholics, The—The Guardian 150
Anglicans Discuss Whether Nonconformist Shall be Allowed to Come to Their Celebration of the Lord's Supper—The Christian World ... 348
Another Lausanne Conference—The Baptist 145
Appeal of Yesterday to the Bible, The—W. J. Lhamon 30
Archbishop Asks the Pope for a New Test in Christian Unity, An—Archbishop Aftemios 353
Are Catholic and Evangelical Views on the Ministry Reconcilable?—W. E. Garman 84
At the Editor's Desk—P.A. 3, 99, 246, 291

Baltimore's Youth Contributes to Religious Unity—E. Foster Dowell .. 46
Baptist, The. Another Lausanne Conference 145
Bartlett, J. Vernon. The Living Church; Its Unity 119
Bishop Gore's Philosophy of the Good Life—Arthur B. Kinsolving 15

Can the Synagogue Claim Jesus?—Ferdinand M. Isserman 335
Catholics Refuse Conference Because They Regard Other Christians as Brothers of Annas and Not of Jesus!—The Roman Catholic Register 362
Celebration of the Lord's Supper, The—S. D. Chown (Cleveland Conference) 199
Chown, S. D. The Celebration of the Lord's Supper (Cleveland Conference) 199
Christianity and World Religion, Report of the Commission on (Cleveland Conference) 229
Christian Unity in China—A. R. Kepler 165
Christian Unity We Now Have, The—Thomas F. Opie 40
Christian World, The. Anglicans Discuss Whether Nonconformist Shall be Allowed to Come to Their Celebration of the Lord's Supper 348
Christian World, The. Fellowship at the Lord's Table 72
Christian World, The. Reunion Via "Catholicity" 184

Church of Tomorrow Must Coöperate to Win, The—Fred B. Smith . . . 91
Churchman, The. Should the Commission on Faith and Order Be Continued? . . . 143
Church Unity Through Christian Education—Alfred Nevin Sayres . . . 250
Cleveland Committee on Invitation to the Conference, The . . . 244
Cleveland Conference, The . . . 199-238
Coblintz, Catherine Cate. Faith . . . 110
Common Heritage of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ and the Evangelical Church, The—Raymond W. Albright . . . 55
Congregationalist, The. Congregationalists and Presbyterians Unite . . . 169
Congregationalists and Presbyterians Unite—The Congregationalist . . . 169
Cowden, John B. Union in His Name . . . 318
Crisis Theology and the Ecumenical Movement, The—Adolf Keller . . . 305

Die, The—Arthur R. McDougall, Jr. . . . 39
Dodd, C. H. Faith and Order at High Leigh . . . 140
Dowell, E. Foster. Baltimore's Youth Contributes to Religious Unity . . 46

Eastern Orthodox Holds Mother of God Dogma, But Balks at Papal Supremacy—The Roman Catholic Register . . . 351
Education for Human Brotherhood—Rufus M. Jones . . . 158

Faith—Catherine Cate Coblintz . . . 110
Faith and Order at High Leigh—C. H. Dodd . . . 140
Fellowship at the Lord's Table—The Christian World . . . 72
Foreword to the Cleveland Conference . . . 197
Friendship Between Jews, Catholics, and Protestants—O. W. S. McCall 81

Garman, W. E. Are Catholic and Evangelical Views on the Ministry Reconcilable? . . . 84
Garvie, Alfred E. This is My Body . . . 297
Guardian, The. The Anglicans and Free Churchmen . . . 148
Guardian, The. The Anglicans and the Old Catholics . . . 150

Hay, Sara Henderson. To One Who Overlooks My Faults . . . 118
Holy Communion and Unity—Romilly F. Humphries . . . 74
How the Churches Coöperate at State Universities—William Lindsay Young . . . 153
Humphries, Romilly F. Holy Communion and Unity . . . 74

I Do Not Believe in Foreign Missions—Fred Smith . . . 134
"In Union There is Strength"—So Testifies Ohio—Vinton E. McVicker 179
Irenic Spirit and Christian Union, The—Frederick D. Kershner . . . 134
Isserman, Ferdinand M. Can the Synagogue Claim Jesus? . . . 335

Jews and Christians, The—Herbert L. Willett 256
Jones, Edgar DeWitt. The Need of Christian Unity Prophets 186
Jones, Rufus M. Education for Human Brotherhood 158

Keller, Adolf. The Crisis Theology and the Ecumenical Movement 305
Kepler, A. R. Christian Unity in China 165
Kershner, Frederick D. The Irenic Spirit and Christian Union 105
Kinsolving, Arthur B. Bishop Gore's Philosophy of the Good Life 15
Klingle, George. The Wounded Christ-Heart 65

Lazaron, Morris S. Dr. Willett's Extraordinary Piece of Work 365
Lhamon, W. J. The Appeal of Yesterday to the Bible 30
Living Church: Its Unity, The—J. Vernon Bartlett 119
Living Church, The. Protestants, Catholics, and Jews to Gather at Washington in 1932 187

McCall, O. W. S. Friendship Between Jews, Catholics, and Protestants 81
McDougall, Arthur R., Jr. The Die 39
McVicker, Vinton E. "In Union There is Strength"—So Testifies Ohio 179
Message of the Conference, Report of the Commission on the (Cleveland Conference) 235
Morton, Richard K. The Reality and Promise of Church Unity 111
Mott, John R. The Price to be Paid to Ensure Christian Unity (Cleveland Conference) 238
Mudge, W. L. Third Biennial Pennsylvania Conference 78

Need of Christian Unity Prophets, The—Edgar DeWitt Jones 186
New York Times, The. A Protestant Response to the Pope's Invitation 358
North India Round Table Conference on Union—W. E. Tomlinson . . . 77

Opie, Thomas F. The Christian Unity We Now Have 40
Our Ludicrous Labels—John R. Scotford 174

Price to be Paid to Ensure Christian Unity, The—John R. Mott (Cleveland Conference) 238
Protestant Response to the Pope's Invitation, A—The New York Times 358
Protestants, Catholics, and Jews to Gather at Washington in 1932—The Living Church 187

Reality and Promise of Church Unity, The—Richard K. Morton 111
Reformed Fundamentalists and Unity—The American Church Monthly 186
Reunion Via "Catholicity"—The Christian World 184

Roman Catholic Register, The. Catholics Refuse Conference Because They Regard Other Christians as Brothers of Annas and Not of Jesus! 362
Roman Catholic Register, The. Eastern Orthodox Holds Mother of God Dogma, But Balks at Papal Supremacy 351

Sayres, Alfred Nevin. Church Unity Through Christian Education . . . 250
Scotford, John R. Our Ludicrous Labels 174
Should the Commission on Faith and Order Be Continued? — The Churchman 143
Silver, Abba Hillel. Dr. Willett's Article one of the Best that has Appeared in Recent Years 364
Smith, Fred B. I Do Not Believe in Foreign Missions 134
Smith, Fred B. The Church of Tomorrow Must Coöperate to Win . . . 91
Sommer, Daniel. What is Our Standard? 66

Third Biennial Pennsylvania Conference—W. L. Mudge 78
This is My Body—Alfred E. Garvie 297
Tomlinson, W. E. North India Round Table Conference on Union . . . 77
To One Who Overlooks My Faults—Sara Henderson Hay 118

Union in His Name—John B. Cowden 318
United Church of Canada, Report of the Commission on the (Cleveland Conference) 201
United Church of the United States, Report of the Commission on the (Cleveland Conference) 209
Unity Movements in Politics, Science, and Industry, and their Influence on Unity Among Christians, Report of the Commission on (Cleveland Conference) 217

"We Will Not Pray With You"—The American Church Monthly 185
What is Our Standard?—Daniel Sommer 66
Willett's Article One of the Best that has Appeared in Recent Years, Dr.—Abba Hillel Silver 364
Willett's Extraordinary Piece of Work, Dr.—Morris S. Lazaron 365
Willett, Herbert L.—The Jews and Christians 256
Wounded Christ-Heart, The—George Klingle 65

Young, William Lindsay. How the Churches Coöperate at State Universities 153

BOOKS REVIEWED

Alternatives of War—Tuttle 95
Appeal for Unity—Sommer 287
Baha'i World, The—Effendi 192
Blue Teapot, The—Dalgliesh 285
Bodyguard Unseen—D'Aquila 284
Book of Prayers for Students, A 192
Calvary To-day—Fiske 284
Can Anglicanism Unite with Rome?—McClellan 286
Christian Liberty and Church Unity—Scherer 366
Chores and the Altar—Campbell 283
Creative Camping—Lieberman 285
Essays on Marriage—Harris 377
Evangelical Offices of Worship and Meditation—Guthrie 192
500 Questions and Answers in Religion—Littell 288
Follow Thou Me—Truett 378
God's Word—Patton 373
Grace in the New Testament—Moffatt 378
Hinterlands of the Church—Hooker 94
History of Fundamentalism, The—Cole 189
Issa—Norwood 282
Is the Christian Church Necessary?—Robbins 375
Jew and his Neighbor, The—Parkes 96
Karl Barth, the Prophet of Apocalypse—Keller 368
Like All Nations?—Magnes 288
Mothers of Famous Men—Wallace 94
It Shall Not Be Again—Clark 374
National Defence—Page 280
New Psychology, Behaviorism, and Christian Experience, The—Main 288
Present-Day Summons to the World Mission of Christianity, The—Mott 279
Quotable Poems—Clark 281
Re-emphasis of Personal Religion, The—Scarlett 287
Religious Control of Emotion, The—Leys 371
Report of the International Congress of Antimilitarist Ministers and Clergymen 288
Significance of Karl Barth, The—McConnachie 370
Some Values for To-day—Olson 95
To-morrow's Faith—Oliver 376
Unique Aloofness of Jesus, The—Bos 191
Unitive Protestantism—McNeill 92
What Can Students Believe?—McKee 93
Word Pictures in the New Testament—Robertson 283
World's Miracle and Other Observations, The—Reiland 190

PRINTED IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE
HESS PRINTING COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MD.

THE
ST. CHARLES

Occupying Entire Block
On the Boardwalk at New Jersey Avenue

ATLANTIC CITY

A Smart Hotel in
America's Smartest Resort

SPRING! Atlantic City calling! Yours for the taking—
the world-renowned Spring Tonic of ocean air
and sunshine. All roads lead to the
St. Charles. Ample parking
space. Do come!

Rates in Keeping with the Times

European or American Plan
French and German Cuisine

CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
1931-1932

DATE	ISSUED TO

DEMCO